

[Dr. K. B. Menon]

[10th July 1952]

“ Sir, as far as the Budget is concerned, I wish to say that there is nothing very striking about it, that it follows the beaten path and that it only maintains the traditions of the Congress for the last five years. It is a deficit Budget and a deficit has to be met either by taxation or by loans. I am glad that the Government have decided to resort to taxation instead of loans, for loans will lead to inflation. But, resorting to taxation does not make a Budget a good Budget. What then is the test of a good Budget? The test of a good Budget is the contribution that the Government make and the lead that they take in nation-building. Times were when the only function of the Government was to maintain law and order, but those Gladstonian days are over and the function of the Government today is much more than maintaining law and order. It is the duty of the Government to participate in activising economy, in initiating new industries and in encouraging new enterprises that contribute to public welfare, in encouraging agriculture, in constructing new roads and in improving means of communication and in a host of other things in which State interest, initiative and investment are necessary. I take it that the Five-year Plan of the Government of India, as well as the Five-year Plan of the Government of Madras envisage these constructive activities or nation-building activities. But when I look through the Budget, I get disappointed. According to the Five-year Plan of the Central Government, 350 crores of rupees are to be spent annually and if a pro rata distribution of that amount is made to the Madras State according to population, one-seventh of it, namely, Rs. 50 crores ought to be spent. According to the Five-year Plan of the Government of Madras, I believe Rs. 130 crores are to be distributed over the five years. Then annually they should spend about Rs. 25 crores. Now, I submit that this is a very poor allotment for this is not likely to meet the needs of the State and it is necessary to spend very much more than what the Government are prepared to spend. I believe the Government are going on the assumption—both in the Centre as well as in the Madras State—that the capitalists of India will have the courage, will have the ability, will have the initiative and the interest in the reorganization of the economy of our country. I submit that that is an assumption which is totally wrong. Our capitalists are a pack of traders whose quest is profit and who have no interest outside themselves. Our capitalists and industrialists are not like their counterparts in the western countries of Europe and America who have been responsible for building up gigantic industrial enterprises and a gigantic economic structure. For this and many other reasons, it is certainly the decisive responsibility of the Government to take more interest in the nation-building work of the State.

9.15
a.m.

“ The Government have failed to give a prominent place to the Five-year Plan. The allotment made for executing the plan is relegated to an appendix in the Finance Minister's Budget speech. According to the White Paper on the Budget that was published by the previous Government, the allotment for the year

10th July 1952]

[Dr. K. B. Menon]

1951-52 was Rs. 33 crores. According to the revised estimate, that was cut down to Rs. 286.9 crores. The proposed allotment for the current year was Rs. 36.6 crores but even that has been cut down to Rs. 26.9 crores. Every time there is a cut in the amount allotted for the Five-year Plan. The amount allotted for nation-building works is not sufficient.

“Next I go to the revenue reserves. The reserves were built up by the British Government during the Second World War. In 1947-48, the reserves stood at Rs. 26.57 crores. They reached the peak figure of Rs. 33.50 crores in 1950-51. From that year onwards there has been a steady depletion. The reserves were brought down to Rs. 23.31 crores in 1951-52, and further down to Rs. 9.41 crores according to the estimate given in the Budget for 1952-53. There should not be such heavy inroads into the reserves. In his Budget speech, the Hon. Finance Minister made the telling remark that the reserves are intended to meet the needs of an emergency. I concede that proposition. But I also feel that, when the Finance Minister draws from the reserves, it is his duty to replenish and bring them back to the original level immediately after the emergency is over. I cannot for a moment believe that an emergency can last for two or three years. Perhaps the assumption of the Finance Minister when he does this is: ‘After me, the deluge!’ That should not be the attitude of any Government. I submit that the Government should be very careful in drawing from the revenue reserves. The amount drawn should as far as possible be replenished and the Revenue Reserve Fund should be brought back to the figure of 1950-51, viz., Rs. 33.50 crores.

“In this connexion, I would like to put a question to the Finance Minister. On page 156 of the Budget Memorandum for 1952-53, we find that the sale of securities stood at Rs. 13.9 crores according to the Preliminary Accounts for 1951-52, while the Budget Estimate for 1952-53 for the sale of securities is only Rs. 8.82 crores. Does this indicate lack of confidence of the public in the Government securities? I know some of the factors that have been operating. For instance, the rise in the bank rate might have had some effect. But I cannot understand this much of a steep fall from Rs. 1.9 crores to Rs. 8.82 crores as a result of that.

“There is another puzzling figure in the Budget Memorandum. While the sale of securities stood at Rs. 8.82 crores in the Budget Estimate for 1952-53, the market value of securities held on the last day of the year based on the market quotations on 15th May 1952 stands at Rs. 56.82 lakhs. Does this Rs. 56.82 lakhs represent all the securities held by the Government against the reserves? As I am unable to understand this figure, I would like to have some explanation from the Finance Minister.

“While I am on figures, I would like to say a few words about the Zamindari Abolition Fund. On page 146 of the Budget Memorandum, it is said that the securities in the Zamindari Abolition Fund stood at Rs. 30.00 lakhs on 31st March 1952,

[Dr. K. B. Menon]

[10th July 1952]

whereas the Budget Estimate as on 31st March 1953 stands at Rs. 51.00 lakhs. I do not know why every year the Government should pay Rs. 51.00 lakhs to zamindars. If I understand aright, the Government have agreed to pay Rs. 12½ crores to the 2,000 to 3,000 zamindars in this State. I understand that it will take ten to fifteen years for the Board of Revenue to complete the survey and settlement operations and only at the end of this period the full Rs. 12½ crores will be paid. Pending the settlement operations, the zamindars are going to be paid a pension or gratuity of nearly Rs. ½ a crore every year by the Madras Government, and for ten to fifteen years, it works out to the sizeable amount of Rs. 5 to 7½ crores. Why should the Government pay as large a sum as Rs. 5 crores to Rs. 7½ crores to zamindars, especially when the State is faced with a deficit Budget? If the Government have agreed to pay Rs. 12½ crores, it is better to pay off the amount once for all and be rid of the matter. I do not know whether that position is tenable. I have made the position of the Socialist Party on this subject very clear. By this annual payment of half a crore, the total amount payable to zamindars will be raised to Rs. 17½ crores to 20 crores. The zamindars who are alive to-day can perhaps bequeath a decent amount to their children which they may draw after ten or fifteen years. This, I feel, is unfair.

“I next come to taxation. As I said in the beginning, the Government are right in resorting to taxation to meet the deficit. Taxation is the right method. But they have taken a wrong decision in collecting the taxes in an indirect way. By the proposed taxation, the Government want to fleece the poor public. I realize that direct taxes will not yield as much revenue as indirect taxes and that it will not be easy for the Government to collect them. But the Government also should realize that indirect taxation is unfair, unjust and bears heavily upon the poor people. Out of over 300 millions of people in India, only 700,000 people are income-tax assesseees—I give the figures from memory. The number of assesseees is very small compared to the total population. If the Government are more careful in seeing that no one who is liable to income-tax escapes assessment and more strict in collecting the tax, I dare say more revenue can be derived. I read an announcement in the newspapers a couple of days ago that the Government of India, by tightening up their departmental organization and conducting investigation into the incomes derived, have been able to increase their revenue from income-tax. I suggest that the Madras Government should do likewise and see whether more revenue cannot be derived from the taxes they have imposed. It is the tradition of the Congress Government to levy indirect taxes. I do not think there has been any Budget presented by the Congress Government, whether at the Centre or in the States, during the last five years in which there has not been an increase in indirect taxation. Of course, the Government will shed crocodile tears before imposing taxes. The Chief Minister was very kind in patting the people on

10th July 1952] [Dr. K. B. Menon]

their back and saying that he will be very considerate in picking their pockets. Judging from this Budget, I do not think the Finance Minister has been very considerate. In Article 286 (3), there is a definite provision that no State Government can impose taxes on articles that are essential for the life of the community. In spite of that provision, tax on necessities of life is being continued and more taxes are being imposed. The Government are taking shelter under the provision that this Article will not affect the taxes that have been in force before the commencement of the Constitution. If the Government are not prepared to give up Sales Tax on all the necessities of life, I request them to remove the tax on at least the extremely essential articles of life like chillies.

“ Let me come to the details of the taxes that are proposed by the Government. First and foremost, I would like to take up the bus tax, because that is a tax that bears most heavily upon the poor. I say that it is a mean tax. When I say ‘mean’, I do not intend any offence. I call the tax mean, because it nibbles into the pocket of the poor man which is already very much depleted. I do not mind the Government nibbling into the pocket of the poor man if there are no other ways open. I cannot for a moment concede that there are no other ways open. I said the other day on the floor of this House that, instead of taxing the poor bus passengers, the Government could as well get hold of the bus owners.

“ The bus owner is not a poor man. He can very conveniently pay. This will only cut the big profits he is making. In the second place, the business of running buses is a paying business. There is little risk involved in the bus business. The ex-Finance Minister Mr. Gopala Reddi in his statement stated that there are nearly two hundred applicants for every bus route. Therefore, it is not very difficult for the Government to make up their deficit. The Government need not hesitate to get hold of the bus owner. They will certainly have to change the method by which routes are allotted to bus owners. If the bus owners are to be squeezed, the system of allotting routes should be changed completely. As it is, I understand that the Government issue permits for buses. These permits, I was made to understand, are sold in the market just as permits for steel, water-pipes, cement, etc., are sold in the market. These permits exchange hands. By sitting in the easy chair and by currying the favour of a Minister, the bus owners get hold of bus permits and pass them on to their friends, and make money in the transaction. I know a number of instances where such things have happened. This system should go. The only reasonable system, when there is such a big demand for bus permit, is to auction it out for the highest bid. Traffic is heavy, and this can be judged from the charges that the Police are making against the bus owners. The demand for permits is also heavy. I see no reason why the permit should not be given for

9-30
a.m.

[Dr. K. B. Menon]

[10th July 1952]

the highest bid. If this is done, I am quite sure that instead of two, as I said the other day, the Government might easily make Rs. 20 crores.

“ The next question that arises is, what do the people get out of the increased charge? I am afraid that the Government so far have failed to set any standard as far as these buses are concerned. Some standard must be set. When nationalization of bus transport in the City was introduced, standards were set for the buses in Madras. I see no reason why there should be two standards, one in the City and the other in the mufassal. The bus travellers in the mufassal should have comfortable (in fact more comfortable) buses, because the roads in the mufassal are bad. They are not like the roads in Madras City. The buses running in the mufassal areas are bone-breakers, and it is very difficult to travel in those buses. I invite the Minister for Transport to have a jolly ride in one of those buses for one day. He is a doctor, and he may treat himself after a journey in the mufassal buses, but the travelling public have no doctors to go to. The long-distance buses are so rickety, so shabby to look at, so dirty, and so inconvenient to travel in, that the Government should insist on better standards of buses, especially when they are thinking of levying a surcharge on bus fares. This is not the first time that the Government have undertaken to raise the bus fares. When the bus fare was raised in Madras City I think there was a rise in the bus fares in the mufassal also. There was then a howl in the City against the raising of bus fares. Something was done in the matter then. But I do not think that anything was done in regard to the mufassal bus fares, because the mufassal travelling public are not organized, and they cannot have their voice of protest heard by the Government. There is a charge of five annas for the first three miles. I ask the Government: Is it fair to impose a fare of five annas for the first three miles? Even if I travel half a mile or one mile, I am asked to pay five annas. This is a very unfair imposition. This should go. In the State of Travancore-Cochin, the charge is only three annas and not five annas. I ask, Sir, why there should be a minimum at all. If at all they require a minimum, they may fix a minimum of one mile. Anything beyond this limit will be hard and harsh upon the travelling public. Sir, I would also like to know whether the surcharge of one pie will be collected from those who pay five annas. This will mean adding insult to injury.

“ What is the solution for all these problems of the bus? How are the Government to get money without imposing heavy taxes upon the public? The only answer that I can give, the only answer that was given on the floor of the Assembly, and the only answer that the Government have accepted, is nationalization. As soon as the Government introduced the nationalization of bus transport in Madras, they got scared. Government became a bit shy, and withdrew. Why did the Government withdraw from

10th July 1952]

[Dr. K. B. Menon]

the plan of nationalization of buses in the mufassal areas? I see no reason why they withdrew. From the financial point of view, buses in the City are paying. It is such a substantial chunk of money that the buses are bringing to the exchequer that the Government are now thinking of exempting the bus travellers in the City from the imposition of the surcharge. Buses are a paying proposition. Why should the Government leave it aside? In no country of the world, I assert, nationalisation or municipalisation of the essential utility services like the railways, buses, trams, etc., has resulted in a loss to the State. It has not been so. When it is a paying concern throughout the world, why should not the Government of Madras extend the nationalisation of bus transport? There is one sneaky suspicion about this. I do not want to attribute any motives. My suspicion is that the last Assembly shied at this proposition because there were a number of Members of the Assembly who were bus permit holders. I hope that the same thing will not happen now. I do not know—I have no statistics with me—if there are any Members of this Assembly who are bus owners. I think in the interests of the nation, they should vote for nationalisation of bus transport. One lady Member yesterday voted for shifting the surcharge on to the bus owner, and I hope that that good example will be followed by others. We can thereby wipe out the deficit. It is not only Rs. 20 crores, but it will be double that figure if nationalisation of bus transport is extended to the mufassal.

“ Apart from all this, Sir, there is the duty cast upon the State to improve the means of communication. Unless there are improved means of communication, unless the people are allowed to congregate, and unless people are allowed to meet together, there will be no exchange of ideas and we will remain a primitive feudal nation for ever. The greatest contribution that Henry Ford made to the civilisation of the United States was the production of the cheap American Ford car popularly called the tin lizzi, in the U.S. which brought the United States into a united nation. I ask a single question, Sir. Before the buses came and before the roads came, how many of our people crossed their linguistic areas and met each other? Unless the Government provide cheap means of transport and improved means of communication, how are the people to mix and mingle with each other, and exchange ideas? Unless we have improved means of communication, we can never expect the demand for linguistic Provinces to go. The Andhras demand the Andhra State. The Tamilnad people will demand the Tamilnad State. The Kerala people will ask for the Kerala State. Because they do not know each other, and they do not move with each other, they do not realise that they are all human beings and that the State should be one State and not divided into so many bits.

“ I now pass on to the betterment levy. The attitude of the Socialist party is that all unearned increment should be expropriated by the Government. People have no right to retain with them the unearned increment, particularly when this unearned

[Dr. K. B. Menon]

[10th July 1952]

increment accrues from the enterprise of the State or society. On this point, we have no difference of opinion, and that is the view of the Socialist party. But as far as the betterment levy is concerned, I have a submission to make. The betterment levy is not a levy on actualities but on potentialities. Let me explain the position. If the levy is intended to tax the improvements that are effected by the new irrigation facilities provided by the State, and if the value of the land has increased as a result thereof, the betterment is only potential until the owner of the land parts company with it and sells it to somebody else. It is only then that the actual increment of the value of the land can be assessed by the State. As far as the improvements are concerned, if there is more production because of the improvements, the person who cultivates the land certainly pays the water cess, and he is also paying increased land revenue. When these two demands are met, I submit that the Government have no business to tax potentialities and to levy a betterment tax. The Government have arbitrarily fixed the date as 1st January 1943. The Government claim the right to levy the tax from this date. I do not know how this date has been arrived at, and what is the basis for this decision. I wish that the Hon. the Finance Minister throws some light on this subject.

“The next point is the levy of surcharge on land revenue. The Socialist Party does not oppose it. But the Socialist Party would ask for the raising of the limit from Rs. 50. If I say the minimum should be Rs. 150, even that will be small. I would like the minimum to be raised to a still higher figure, and that is the demand of the Socialist Party. Another submission that I have to make in connection with this levy is that in the Act it is very necessary to state that this is only a surcharge and not a permanent tax. If this is not specifically stated in the Act, it is very likely that the Government may go on collecting this tax; but if it is specifically stated that it is only a surcharge, the Government will have to come to the Assembly every year and get this renewed. Therefore, I submit that it is very necessary that it should be stated in the Act that this is only a surcharge and not a permanent tax. One other point in connection with this surcharge on land revenue and betterment levy is that the Government should see that this surcharge and betterment levy are not shifted. It is very difficult, I understand, to prevent the shifting of these two taxes. But I hope that the Government will devise some ways by which the shifting of the incidence of taxation is prevented.

“Sir, I would like to say a few words about the petrol tax. On the imposition of this tax, I may say I have not much objection. The motorists can afford to pay this tax, and they can have no grievance against this. I cannot see why the Government have a soft corner for the bus owners and why they should exempt them from the petrol tax. The Government are imposing the surcharge on the travelling public, and they do not come to the rescue of the people. But the Government are exempting bus

10th July 1952]

[Dr. K. B. Menon]

owners from the petrol tax! This is a very suspicious attitude on the part of the Government, and they must explain. I ask the Government to get the petrol tax from the bus owners also so that they may be made to make some contribution at least to meet the deficit. There are many hidden assets in the Budget. I am quite sure, Sir, that if all the hidden assets are taken into account, and if care is taken to see that bus owners are not allowed to escape, there will not be any necessity to impose heavy taxes on the poor people."

DR. T. S. SOUNDARAM RAMACHANDRAN:—"On a point of order, Sir. The hon. Member Dr. K. B. Menon said that I pleaded against nationalisation of bus transport. I never touched the subject of nationalisation of bus transport at all."

MR. SPEAKER:—"It is a point of personal explanation. It is not a point of order."

DR. T. S. SOUNDARAM RAMACHANDRAN:—"Thank you, Sir."

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—"On a point of order, Sir. Yesterday I rose on a point of information, but I was not allowed to speak. To-day the hon. Lady Member rose on a point of information and the Hon. Speaker allowed her to speak."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Lady Member rose by saying that she wanted to raise a point of order. Afterwards, she raised a point of information." (Laughter.)

SRI G. LATCHANNA:—"అధ్యక్షా, ఈ బడ్జెటులోని మంచిచెడ్డలను దాని స్వరూపాన్ని గురించి చర్చించి దాన్ని బలపరచుట, ప్రతిఘటించుట వా ఆధిపత్యముని చెప్పటకు ముందుగా మా క్రిఫిల్ లో పార్టీయొక్క విధానమేమో తెలుపుడు చేయవలసిన అవసరమేర్పడినది. ఇదివరకు అనేక సంధ్యములలో ఈ విషయమై మేము ప్రకటించియున్నప్పటికీ అనేక మంది అనేక ఆధిపత్యాలను, సందేహాలను ప్రకటించి ఉన్నందువల్ల తిరిగి ఈ ప్రభుత్వము పట్టి మా ఆధిపత్యము లేమో మా విధానమేమో స్పష్టముగా ప్రకటించదలచినాను. క్రిఫిల్ లో పార్టీ ప్రస్తుతము అధికారములోవున్న రాజాజీ మంత్రివర్గాన్ని ఎందుకు బలకరుస్తున్నదనే విషయంలో పలువురు పలువిధములైన ఆధిపత్యములను వెల్లడించి ఉన్నారు. మా పార్టీవారు రాజాజీ మంత్రివర్గాన్ని కొన్నికొన్ని సంధ్యములలో, సిద్ధాంతాలకు, ఆశయాలకు వైరుధ్యములేని విషయములలో బలపరచదలచినదనే విషయంలో ఎంత మాత్రం సందేహం లేదు. ఈ మంత్రివర్గానికి మేము responsive co-operation ఇస్తామని ముట్టుముడుటనే చెప్పిఉన్నాము. ఆ ఆధిపత్యాన్ని ఢంకవరకు మేము మార్చుకొనలేదని కూడా సందేహాలు వెలివిచ్చేవారు గ్రహించగోర్రాను. ప్రజాస్వామికంలో ఒక రాజకీయ పక్షము వేరొక రాజకీయ పక్షాన్ని పరిపాలనా రంగంలో బలకరపడమనేది ప్రజాస్వామ్య విధానమనడంలో ఎట్టి సందేహములేదని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. గత ఎన్నికల ఫలితములను గమనించి దూచినట్లయితే ఈ రాష్ట్రంలోని విభిన్న రాజకీయ పక్షానికి తనంతట తాను మంత్రివర్గాన్ని ఏర్పాటుచేసి పరిపాలనను సాధించే స్థానము లేదని రుజువువుతుంది. ఈ శాసన సభకు నిర్ణయించిన 375 స్థానములలో

[Sri G. Latchanna]

[10th July 1952]

కాంగ్రెస్ వారు 152 సీట్లను మాత్రమే గెలుచగలిగారు. అలాగే కమ్యూనిస్టులు 70 సీట్లు సంపాదించగలిగారు. అదేవిధంగా ఇతర రాజకీయ పార్టీలు, స్వతంత్రులు కూడా ఎన్ని కలలో గెలుపొందారు. ఈ పరిస్థితులలో ఏ రెండు, మూడు, పార్టీలు గాని చేరనిదే ప్రభుత్వాన్ని ఏర్పాటుచేయడం సాధ్యపడదు. ఇదే అభిప్రాయంతోనే కొన్ని కొన్ని రాజకీయ పార్టీలు, స్వతంత్రులు కలసి వారంతా U.D.F. అనే పార్టీగా ఏర్పడినామని తమ సంఖ్య 166 ఉన్నదని ఇదివరలో గవర్నరుగారికి తెలుపుకున్నారు. ఎన్ని కలలో ఒక పార్టీవారితో ఇంకొక పార్టీవారు పోటీచేసినంతమాత్రాన సుస్థిరమైనటువంటి ప్రభుత్వాన్ని ఏర్పాటుచేయడానికి ఆ పార్టీలవారు ఒకరిలో మరొకరు సహకరించడమనేది ప్రజాస్వామ్య విధానమనడంలో ఎంతమాత్రం సందేహం లేదు. అంతే కాకుండా నేటి మన రాష్ట్రపరిస్థితులలో అది అత్యంత అవసరమనికూడా మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. మన దేశం ప్రజాస్వామ్య సూత్రాలను అనుసరిస్తుందని రాజ్యాంగ చట్టంలో నిర్వచించబడినది. అనగా దేశంలో ఉన్నటువంటి రాజకీయ పక్షాలు పార్లమెంటులో కార్యక్రమంలో సమైక్యం కలిగి ఉండాలని, అటువంటివాటికే రాజ్యాధికారం అప్పగించినట్లయితే దేశం అభివృద్ధి పొందునని అర్థం. ఏ ఒక్క రాజకీయ పార్టీకి తగినంత సంఖ్యలైన లేనపుడు మరొక పార్టీయొక్క సహాయ, సహకారాలను పొందడంలో ఎటువంటి పారపాటు లేదు. ఈ సిద్ధాంతాలను దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకొన్నట్లయితే మా పార్టీ రాజాజీ అధ్యక్షుడినంద విరచిస్తే ఈ ప్రభుత్వానికి సందర్భించితంగా సహకరించడంవల్ల మేము ఎటువంటి తప్పుడు పంథాను అవలంబించలేదని ధృవపడుతుంది. మేము రాజాజీ ప్రభుత్వాన్ని బలపరచడంలో మరొక ముఖ్య కారణం కూడా మనవి చేస్తాను. కొంతమంది కృషిలో పార్టీవారు కాంగ్రెస్ పార్టీవారికి బానిసలై పోయారని విపరీతవితండవాదాలను లేపడం వారు. దీనికి కారణం కాంగ్రెస్ వారిని ఎన్ని కలలో వ్యతిరేకించిన మేము కాంగ్రెసు ప్రభుత్వానికి సహకరించడమేనని వారి వాదన. ఈ వాదనలో ఎటువంటి పట్టులేములేదని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. మా పార్టీ వారు ఎన్ని కలలో పోటీచేసినది ఒక్క కాంగ్రెస్ వారిని మాత్రమే కాదని వారు దృష్టి యందుంచుకోవాలి. మేము కమ్యూనిస్టులతోనూ, ఇతర రాజకీయ పార్టీలవారితోనూ కూడా పోటీచేశాము. కొన్ని స్థానాలు జయించగలిగాము. ఈనాడు ఎన్ని కలు అయిపోయి సుస్థిరమైన ప్రభుత్వాన్ని రాష్ట్రంలో నెలకొల్పవలసిన తరుణం వచ్చినది. ఈ సందర్భ సమయంలో ఏ పార్టీవారిని మేము బలపరచాలి, ఏ పార్టీవారు ప్రజాస్వామ్య సిద్ధాంతాలకు కట్టుబడిఉంటారు అనే ప్రశ్నను పరిష్కరించాలి. కాంగ్రెస్ పార్టీకి తదితర ఏ ఒక్క పార్టీకన్న ఎక్కువ స్థానాలు లభించాయి. కాంగ్రెస్ పార్టీ తరువాత కమ్యూనిస్టు పార్టీ ఎక్కువ స్థానాలు గెలుచుకొన్నది. ఈ రెండు పార్టీలలో దేనిని బలపరచడంలేననే ప్రశ్న మమ్మ ఎదుర్కొన్నప్పుడు మేము కాంగ్రెసు పార్టీనే బలపరచడమేకొన్నాము. ఈ సహకారంకుండా కాంగ్రెస్ విడితెలితే దానికి 'ఊ', 'ఊ', 'ఊ' అనేటటువంటివిధంగా కాదు. విషయముల, విధానాల మంచితెడ్డల ఆలోచించి, మా పార్టీ సిద్ధాంతాలకు ధిగం కలుగునంతవరకు రాజాజీ మంత్రివర్గాన్ని బలపరచడానికే మేము అంగీకరించాము."

SRI B. SANKARAYYA :—“లచ్చన్నగారు మాట్లాడే విషయాలు ఈ బడ్జెటుకు సంబంధించినవి కావు.”

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“బడ్జెటును బలపరచుచున్నాను, వ్యతిరేకిస్తున్నాను అనే విషయంలో మా పార్టీ విధానమేమో మనవి చేస్తూ, మేము ఇంతవరకు అవలంబించిన విధానంవల్ల కొందరు సందేహితులు వెలుబుచ్చిన అభిప్రాయాలకు

10th July 1952]

[Sri G. Latchanna]

సమాధానంగా మనవిచేయదలచుకొన్నాను. ఎన్నికల ఫలితములు ప్రకటించబడిన తరువాత ఈ రాష్ట్రములో కమ్యూనిస్టులు U.D.F. అనే పేరుతో ప్రభుత్వాన్ని ఏర్పాటుగతం చేసుకొన వయస్తి మున్నప్పడు మా పార్టీ అటు కమ్యూనిస్టుల బలాధిక్యమున్న U.D.F. ను బలపరచడమా లేక కాంగ్రెస్ ను బలపరచడమా అనే విషయాన్ని పరిశీలించి, రాజాజీ ఆధ్వర్యాన్ని నిర్వహించబడే ప్రభుత్వాన్నే బలపరచ నిర్ణయించింది. దీని ఆర్థం కాంగ్రెస్ వారిని మేము వి విషయం లోబడితే దానిలో బలపరుస్తామని మా తము కాదు. మేము యీ నిర్ణయానికి రావడం మా ఆధిప్తాయంలో కమ్యూనిస్టుల కన్న కాంగ్రెసువారు ప్రజాస్వామ్య సిద్ధాంతాలకు కట్టుబడి ఉంటారనే నమ్మకంతోడనేనని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. మేము కొద్దికాలం క్రితంవరకు కాంగ్రెస్ సంస్థలో ఉన్నవారమే. ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్ర కాంగ్రెస్ సంఘాన్ని నడిపినవారమే. కాంగ్రెస్ సంస్థలో మురా తత్వం ప్రబలిపోయి యావత్ పరిపాలనారంగం లంక గొండితనంతోను, అగ్రత పక్షపాతంతోను నిండి ఉన్నప్పడు ఆ సంస్థనుంచి వీలిపోయినాము. మాకు కాంగ్రెస్ సంస్థలో ఉన్న విభేదము చాలావరకు ఈ హంతకమీదనే; కాని మాకు కమ్యూనిస్టులతో మైత్రి ఎన్నడు లేదు. గత పది సంవత్సరాలుగా మేము వారిని ఎదిరిస్తున్నాము. కమ్యూనిస్టు సిద్ధాంతాలు, ఆచరణలో వారు అవలంబించే పద్ధతులు మాకు కానుగా తెలుసు. నిరంకుశం విధానంతోనే వారికి నమ్మకం. వర్గ కలహాలను రేపిల్లించడంలో వారు అరితేరారు. ప్రజాస్వామ్య సిద్ధాంతాలన్నా, ప్రజాస్వామిక సంస్థలన్నా వారికి నమ్మకం లేదు. అటువంటి కమ్యూనిస్టులలో మాకున్న వైరము ఈనాటిదికాదు. వారిని మేము రంగంగారి నాయకత్వాన గత పది సంవత్సరములనుంచి ఎదిరించుచున్నాము. కమ్యూనిస్టులలో మాకున్న ఈ సిద్ధాంతాల వైదిధ్యం వల్లనే మేము కాంగ్రెస్ ప్రభుత్వాన్ని బలపరచినాము. అదే ఉద్దేశ్యంతోనే మన రాష్ట్రంలో సుస్థిర ప్రభుత్వం ఉండాలనే కారణంచేత మేము మున్నటి విశ్వాస ప్రకటన తీర్మానాన్ని బలపరచినాము. మా పార్టీవారికి కమ్యూనిస్టుల విధానములలో ఎటువంటి నమ్మకము లేదని మరొక పర్యాయము స్పష్టముచేస్తున్నాను.

“కమ్యూనిస్టులు ప్రచారం చేయుటలో చాలా అరితేరినవారు. అందులో అసత్యమైన విషయాలును సత్యాలుగా చెప్పటానికి వారు ఎన్ని సార్లుయినా ప్రయత్నం చేస్తారు. ఒక అబద్ధాన్ని వదిలూరులు నిజమని చెప్పివట్లయితే దానిని ప్రజలు నమ్ముతారని వారి విశ్వాసము. ఈ నమ్మకం వారిలో దృఢంగా పాతుకుపోయింది. కొంత వరకు వారు ఈ ప్రచార రంగంలో జయం సంపాదించారనిమాడ చెప్పవలసియున్నది. ప్రజలను తాత్కాలికంగా మభ్యపెట్టగలిగారని అనుటలో ఎంతమాత్రం సందేహం లేదు. కాని తొందరతోనే ప్రజలు కమ్యూనిస్టు సిద్ధాంతాలలోని బండారాన్ని తెలుసుకొన గలిగిన కమ్యూనిస్టులు గ్రహించగోర్రాదు. చిరకాలం వారి ప్రచార పటత్వం ప్రజలను నమ్మించలేదు. ఈ ప్రచార సందర్భంలో కమ్యూనిస్టులు ఉచితానుచితాలు అలాచించకుండా ప్రశ్నిర్థలమీద అభాండాలు కురిపించడం వారి ప్రచార రంగంలో ప్రధాన భాగం. అందువల్లనే మున్న ఒక కమ్యూనిస్టు సభ్యుడు ప్రసంగిస్తూ మా పార్టీకి సంబంధించిన కారు సింధియా కంపెనీ కార్మికులచిన్నట్లు ఆరోపణచేశారు. ఇందులోని నిజాలను తెలుసుకొనవలసెనటే నాపై బహిరంగ విచారణ చేయించవలసినదని నేను కోరుతున్నాను. నా 25 ఏండ్ల రాజకీయ జీవితకాలంలో ఎటువంటి లోపములైనను జూరగలిగవట్లయితే నేను కమ్యూనిస్టులను ఇక ఏమీ ఆననని గట్టిగా చెబుతున్నాను. మిథ్యారోపణలను చేయుటతోడనే సంతృప్తి పడక వాటిని స్వాయంగా విచారణ చేయించి నిజానిజమును కనుగొనవలసినదని సభ్యులకు మనవిచేస్తున్నాను.”

[10th July 1952]

SRI P. T. RAJAN:—"On a point of order, Sir. The hon. Member has his points jotted down in English while he is speaking in Telugu. Is he right in speaking in Telugu."

SRI G. LATCHANNA:—"కృషిలో పార్టీ తనయొక్క సిద్ధాంతాలను, ఆశయాలను ప్రజల ఎదుట వుంచినది. కంట్రోల్ను రద్దుచేయడం. ప్రజాస్వామ్య సూత్రాలను అనుసరించి రైతు కూలీ ప్రజారాజ్యాన్ని సాధించడం అనేవి ముఖ్యమంత్రియ్యలు. సంఘంలో ఎటువంటి మార్పులు రావలసిన వాటిని దౌర్జన్యరహిత మార్గాల ద్వారా సాధించడమే మా పద్ధతి. ఇందులో ఎంతమాత్రం రహస్యంలేదు. ఈ ఆశయాలకొరకే మేము ఈ నాడు రాజాజీ మంత్రివర్గాన్ని బలపరుస్తున్నాం. వెన్నెదొకటి, చేనేదొకటి మూల సిద్ధాంతంగాగల కమ్యూనిస్టులు అందరిని శంకించడమే పనిగా పెట్టుకుంటారు. మా మాటలకు చేతలకు వ్యత్యాసమేమైన వున్నదేమో విచారకరంగా విచారణచేయించవచ్చు."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"On a point of order, Sir. I would like to know under which Demand all the things referred to by the hon. Member come."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member should also realise my difficulty. I do not know Telugu. Therefore, I do not know what the hon. Member Sri G. Latchanna has said (Laughter.) Let him continue."

SRI G. LATCHANNA:—"రాజగోపాలాచారిగారి మంత్రివర్గాన్ని బలపరుస్తున్నామంటే అది వారేమంటే దానికి తలపూపడంమాత్రం కాదని తిరిగి విస్పష్టం చేస్తున్నాను. వారు అమలుపరచిన కంట్రోలు రద్దు విధానంతో మేము వికీర్ణం విస్తాము. కాని, వారు అమలు జరుపుతున్న మధ్యపాన నిషేధ విధాన విషయంలో మాకు అభిప్రాయ భేదమున్నది. ఈ నాడు ప్రొహిబిట్ శాసనము సరిగా అమలు జరుగుట లేదనేది నిర్వివాదాంశము. ఈ విధానంలో ఎట్టిలోపాలులేవు అని అనడం సామాన్యమేనని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ప్రత్యేక కారణాలలో మధ్యపాన నిషేధ శాఖ మాత్రమే తమకు తెలిసినంతవరకు ఈ శాసనము జయప్రదంగా కొనసాగుతోందని, పూర్వం కల్లుగిరి దీపపాధి సంపాదించుకొంటూ ఈ సంస్కరణవల్ల నిరుద్యోగులైన గీతగాండ్లకు యితర రకాల ఆర్జన వృత్తులు కల్పించబడ్డాయి అని చెప్పడంకూడా సరి కాదని నా అభిప్రాయం. ఈ ప్రకటన రీయదార్థానికి చాలాదూరం. కేవలం ఆధ్యాత్మిక సూత్రాలను, వైతిక ధర్మాలను బట్టి ఈ సంస్కరణను అవరణలో పెట్టడం సాధ్యంకాదు. ప్రొహిబిట్ విధానంయొక్క మూల సిద్ధాంతాలతో నాకెట్టి విభేదంలేదు. వి సంస్కరణను మనము ప్రవేశ పెట్టదలచినా ఆ సంస్కరణలోని మంచిని ఎంతవరకు ప్రజలు గుర్తించగలుగుతున్నారు, ప్రజాసామాన్యం ఎంతవరకు దానిని అవరణలో పెట్టుగలరు అనే వాస్తవిక విషయాలను బాగుగ గుర్తించాలి. మానవ ప్రకృతిని కూడా మార్చడమనేది సాధ్యంకాదు ; సాధించబూనడంకూడ సామాన్య ప్రమాద ఘాతం అని గుర్తుంచుకోవాలి. మధ్యపాన నిషేధ శాసనము ఎంతవరకు జయప్రదంగా కొనసాగింపబడుతోంది, లేదు అనే విషయమై పరిశీలించే నిమిత్తం ఒక కమిటీని వేయడం చాలా అవసరము. ప్రజలలో ఈ సంస్కరణ పట్ల యెటువంటి అభిప్రాయం ప్రబలివుందో నిస్పక్షపాత బుద్ధితో సమీక్ష చేసి వెన్నెదొకటిని యేర్పాటు చేయుట ఎంతేని అవసరము. ఇందులోని యదార్థ విషయాలను యీ శాసన సభాసభ్యులకు తెలియ చేయడం, మధ్యపాన నిషేధం జయప్రదంగా కొనసాగుతోందని నచ్చ చెప్పడం రాజగోపాలాచారిగారి ధర్మం."

10th July 1952]

[Sri G. Latchanna]

“ఇదివరలో కల్లు గీతవల్ల జీవనోపాధి సంతోషించుకొనేవారు యీ నాడు వారి పుత్తి పోయి నిరుద్యోగులైతారు. వీరికి వేరు పుత్తలను కల్పించుటకు ప్రభుత్వం వారు యంతవరకు తగినంత శ్రద్ధ తీసుకోలేదని ప్రభుత్వంవారికి సవినయంగా మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ప్రావీలిజ్ శాఖ మంత్రిగారు యీ విషయమై తగినంత శ్రద్ధ తీసుకోమని వారిని కోరుతున్నాను. దొంగతనంగా చాలామంది సారాకాయడం యీ నాడు పరిపాటిఅయిపోయింది. త్రాగేవారి సంఖ్యకూడా పెప్పుకోతగినంతగా తగ్గలేదు. ఇదివరకు యే ఆడాస్ రెండవలో మూడవలో యిచ్చి త్రాగేవారు యీనాడు దానికే పనెండవాలనుంచి రూపాయివరకు ఖర్చుచేసి త్రాగుతున్నారు. ఇదివరకు వార్లం వదిరోజులకు ఖర్చుచేసే మొత్తం యీనాడు ఒక్కరోజులోనే ఖర్చుచేస్తున్నారు. వైగా వారు త్రాగే పదార్థంకూడా అసలు కల్లు కన్న ఎక్స్ రెట్లు అపాయకరమైనది. ఈ యదార్థ విషయాలను గమనించాలని రాజగోపాలాచారిగారికి మరిల మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ప్రావీలిజ్ మూలసిద్ధాంతాలలో మాత్రమే అభిప్రాయబేధములేదు. ఈ శాసనము అవరణలో జయప్రదంగా కొనసాగుతోందా, ప్రజలు యీ సంస్కరణకు సిద్ధంగావున్నారా అనే విషయాలను వారు పరిశీలించేయాలని కోరుతున్నాను. ఈ విషయంలో ప్రతిష్టకు యేమాత్రం ఛగంలేదని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ఇతర రాష్ట్రాలలో ఈ విషయమై కొన్ని ప్రభుత్వములవారు పునః పరిశీలన చేయటానికి ప్రత్యేక కమిటీలను యేర్పాటు చేస్తున్నట్లు పత్రికలలో చూస్తున్నాము. అదేవిధంగా మన రాష్ట్రంలోకూడా ఒక కమిటీని యేర్పాటుచేసి ఈ శాసనానికి అవసరమైన సవరణలను చేయడం నుంచిదని ప్రభుత్వంవారికి తెలియచేస్తున్నాను. లేనిచో ఆరాచకానికి దోహదమౌతుంది. అమలు పరచ పాధ్యంకాని శాసనాన్ని ప్రవేశపెట్టి ప్రజలలో శాసనధిక్కారబుద్ధిని ప్రోత్సహించడం ప్రభుత్వంవారిని కోరుతున్నాను.

10
a.m.

“ఆంధ్రరాష్ట్రం విషయంలో మా పార్టీ దృక్పథమేమో మనవిచేస్తాను. ఈ ఆంధ్రరాష్ట్ర సమస్యను పరిష్కరించ బూసకపోవడం ఆంధ్రులలో చాలా అసంతృప్తి కల్పించినదని చెప్పటంలో ఎంతమాత్రం సందేహంలేదు. మేము ఆంధ్రరాష్ట్ర కాంగ్రెస్ సంఘంలో పుస్తపుడు రంగాగారి అధ్యక్షాన యే దృక్పథం ఆనాటి కాంగ్రెస్ సంఘం వెలిబుచ్చిందో ఈనాడు కూడా మేము అదే దృక్పథంతోవున్నాము. నిర్వివాద ప్రాంతాలతో ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్రాన్ని యేర్పాటు చేయవలసినదేనని మా అభిప్రాయం. వివాద ప్రాంతాల విషయమై మధ్యవర్తి తీర్పుకు అన్ని పక్షాలవారు ఆంగీకరించాలి. వి సమన్వయనను పరిష్కరించుటకు సర్వే సర్వత్ర వికీభావం వుండాలనే షరతుపెట్టుట ఆ సమన్వయపరిష్కారాన్ని వెనుకపెట్టే ప్రయత్నమేనని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. అభిప్రాయ భేదాలున్నపుడు వాటిని మధ్యవర్తి తీర్పుకు వదలడం అనేది ఉభయపక్షాలకు న్యాయంచేయడమన్నమాట. ఇది ప్రజాస్వామ్య సూత్రాలకు అనుగుణమైన విధానమని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ఈ ముఖ్య సిద్ధాంతాన్ని కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వం ఎందుకు గుర్తించకుండావుందో నెలకూ పండితుడు ఎందువల్ల ఆంధ్రులపై ఇంతటి అసాధ్యమైన షరతును రుద్ద ప్రయత్నిస్తున్నాడో బోధపడటం లేదు. మద్రాసు పట్టణంవంటి వివాదప్రాంతాల విషయాలను యితర ఆర్థిక విషయాలను మధ్యవర్తి తీర్పుకు వదలవలసిందని కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వంవారిని కోరుతున్నాను.

“ఆంధ్రరాష్ట్రం విర్పడకపోవడంవల్ల ఆంధ్రదేశంలోని ప్రాజెక్టులను, యితర అభివృద్ధి పథకాలను అమలు పరచడంలో ఆలస్యమౌతోందనే విషయంలో నిజం లేకపోలేదు. మా శ్రీకాకుళం జిల్లాలోని వంశధారా మొదలైన ప్రాజెక్టులను యంతవరకు

[Sri G. Latchanna]

[10th July 1952]

నిర్మించకపోవడం ఇందుకు ప్రబల నిదర్శనము. ఈ సమిష్టి ప్రభుత్వం ఆంధ్రులకు అన్యాయంచేయడంలేదు అని యుజుభుతేయాలంటే ప్రస్తుత పరిపాలనా పద్ధతిలో మార్పులు తీసుకోరావాలి. ఆంధ్ర జిల్లాలను ఒక ప్రత్యేక ఎడ్మినిస్ట్రేటివ్ యూనిట్ గా ఏర్పాటుచేయాలి. వివిధ శాఖలలో ప్రత్యేక డివిజన్లు ఏర్పాటుచేయాలి. ఆంధ్ర ప్రాంతంనుంచి వచ్చే ఆదాయం, ఖర్చుచేసే మొత్తం ప్రత్యేకంగా చూపుకూతుండాది. దీనివల్ల పరిపాలనాపౌలభ్యమేకాకుండా ఎంతో అసంతృప్తిని విచారించినవారూ తామని రాజగోపాలాచారిగారికి సమీపయంగా మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ప్రత్యేక ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్రం యేర్పడుటకు ముందుగానే యీ ఏర్పాట్లు చేసినట్లయితే రాష్ట్రం వచ్చిన తరువాత ఎవరి పరిపాలనను వారు కొనసాగించుకొనడం తెలిక అవుతుంది. ఈ విషయంలో రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు శ్రద్ధచూపుతారని అతపడుతున్నాను. ఈ సమస్యను పరిష్కరించడం ఆయనకు అసాధ్యమైనపనికాదు. ముఖ్యంగా కాపిటల్ వర్క్స్ ను అమలు పరచటంలో ఆంధ్రులకు అన్యాయంజరుగుతోంది. ఈ విషయాలు రాజగోపాలాచారిగారికి తెలియనివికావు. ఈ సమిష్టి రాష్ట్రంలో ఆంధ్ర జిల్లాలు తల్లి తండ్రిలేని బిడ్డలుగా చూడబడడం యిక యంతమాత్రం ఆంధ్ర ప్రజలు సహించరు. ప్రజానిప్రాయాన్ని ఎవరూకూడా త్రోసిపుచ్చరాదు. అది ప్రజాస్వామిక సూత్రాలకే విరుద్ధం. కాబట్టి ప్రభుత్వ యంత్రాంగంలోని వివిధ డిపార్టుమెంట్లను ఆంధ్ర ప్రాంతానికి, ఆంధ్రేతరప్రాంతానికి సంబంధించినవిగా ప్రత్యేకించవలసిందని రాజగోపాలాచారిగారిని కోరుతున్నాను.

“ఆంధ్ర ప్రావిన్సు విషయము లేవేరకు ఆంధ్ర తమిళ headquarters మదరాసులోనే వుంది administration నడిపించవలెను. ప్రస్తుతము గవర్నరు ముంటువారు నడుపుతున్న పరిపాలనా విధానములో పూర్తి మార్పులు చేయాలి. ప్రస్తుతము నడుపబడుచున్న విధానము సమగ్రంగా జరుగుచున్నదా లేదా అని పరీక్షించుట చాలా అవసరము. ఇప్పుడు ఉన్న departments overhaul చేసి ఆంధ్ర జిల్లాలకు ఆంధ్రులను తమిళ జిల్లాలకు తమిళులను వేయవలెను. Administration నడుపుటకు తగిన సలహాల నిచ్చుటకు అనగా to find out ways and means, to create efficiency in the administration, to check red-tapism and to check corruption in the services ఒక సంఘమును నియమించాలి. దీనివల్ల retrenchment చేయుటకుగూడ సావకాశములుండును, ప్రస్తుతపు ఖర్చులుగూడా చాలావరకు తగ్గును. కొన్ని departments ప్రస్తుతము కొన్ని controls వగైరా ఎత్తిచేసినందువల్ల కొన్ని departments remove చేయుటకు సావకాశమున్నది. Revenue Board Prohibition department ఎత్తివేయాలి. Departments లో administration సమగ్రంగా జరుగుటకు ఒక efficiency committee ని చేసి administrative defects అన్నీ ప్రభుత్వ పరిశీలకు లేవలెను. ఈ ప్రభుత్వ పరిపాలన సరిగా జరుపుటకు efficiency committee వారు establishment లో efficiency list ను తయారు చేయవలెను. ఇంకను ప్రతి ఖాసా ప్రాతంగా న్యాయంగరిగేటట్లు చేయాలి, ఇప్పటికే ఆంధ్రులకు promotions వగైరాలలో అన్యాయం జరుగుతున్నది. ఈ విషయం యీ efficiency committee ఆలోచించవలసియుండుంది. ప్రజలతోను ప్రభుత్వంతోను సన్నిహిత సంబంధం ఉండాలి. ఇందుకుగాను Public Relations Officer ను ఒక అతనిని నియమించాలి. ప్రజలకు సరియైన న్యాయం ప్రభుత్వంలో జరగాలంటే ఏదైన ప్రభుత్వంలో అన్యాయం జరిగిన ఎడల ప్రజలు యీ Public Relations Officer ద్వారా ప్రజల కష్టముఖాలను ప్రభుత్వమునకు తెలియపరచవలెను. ప్రజల సహకారము ప్రభుత్వసాంబాలంటే ఇటువంటి department అవసరమని

10th July 1952]

[Sri G. Latchanna]

విషయపూర్వకముగా మనవి చేయుచున్నాను. వైస్ చెప్పిన efficiency committee విషయములలో ఒక సంగతి చెప్పదలచుకున్నాను. గవర్నమెంటు డిపార్టుమెంట్లలో efficient staff ను తయారుచేసే promotions వగైరా పరిశీలించవలెను. ఈ విషయం శ్రీ రాజాజీగారిశోకూడా చెప్పియున్నాను. యీ విషయములో నేను మరల తాని హెచ్చరిస్తున్నాను. వారు దీనిని గురించి తగు శ్రద్ధ తీసుకొందురని నమ్ముచున్నాను. పరిశీలన యీ వార్తలు ప్రకటించ బడ్డాయి. ఆంధ్రుల విషయములన స్వాయాన్యాయాలను యీ efficiency committee పరిశీలించుటకు వీలగును.

“ ఇక పోతే జిల్లాలో గూడ administration కొరకు ఒక administration committee ని వెయ్యవలెను. జిల్లా అధికారులకు వారి క్రింది అధికారులకు సరియైన సన్నిహిత సంబంధముండవలెను. ఇప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వంవారు విర్వాటుచేసిన కమిటీలు దండుగగా T.A. పుచ్చుకొంటున్నారేగాని పని జరగడం లేదు. అందువల్ల వాటిని తీసివేసి, జిల్లా కమిటీయన్నూ, లాలూకా కమిటీయన్నూ విర్వాటుచేసి ప్రజల కష్ట సుఖాలను వాటిమూలంగా ప్రభుత్వమునకు తెలియపరుచుటకు ప్రయోగముగా నుండును.

“ ఇక పోతే బడ్జెటు విషయములలోకి వస్తే బడ్జెటు మాకు అంత చెప్పుకో తగ్గ తృప్తికరంగా లేదు. అందువల్ల నేను యీ బడ్జెటును వ్యతిరేకించుచున్నాను. రాజగోపాలాచారిగారి హయాములో ఇటువంటి బడ్జెటును తయారుచేయుట మనది చాలా శోచనీయంగా భువ్విది. అని చెప్పుచున్నాను. Finance Minister గారు local bodies కు గాను రీరి లక్షల రూపాయలు కేటాయించామని చెప్పారు. ఇది కాకుండా యీ లోకల్ బాడీసుకు లోన్లు క్రింద కొంత సొమ్ము కేటాయించారని చెప్పారు. ఇదిగాక City Improvement Trust కు గాను వది లక్షలు కేటాయించామన్నారు. రాష్ట్రములో సున్న 27 జిల్లాలలో భువ్విటువంటి local bodies కు loans గా ఇచ్చే రీరి లక్షల రూపాయలు వి శద్ధతమీద యిస్తున్నారో అర్థం కావడం లేదు. జిల్లాలలో housing societies ఏవి గూడా సరిగా పనిచేయుట లేదు. వాటి విషయమై నేనోడి సలహా యివ్వదలచుచున్నాను. పట్నంలో చాలా యీ గ్రామాలు చాలా హీనస్థితిలోనుండుటవల్ల యీ గ్రామాలకు గూడ సహజ ప్రతికత్తి ఇవ్వాలని మా K.L.P. పార్టీయొక్క మూలతత్వం. గ్రామాలలో వసతులు లేక ప్రజలందరు పట్నములు చేరుతున్నారు. Electricity వగైరా వసతులు గ్రామాలకు కలిగించాలి. గ్రామములలో ప్రజలు అనేక యిబ్బందులు పడుతున్నారు. ప్రభుత్వంవారు యిప్పుడు building societies కు house construction కు గాను లోన్లు యిస్తున్నారు, గాని గ్రామాలలో ఇవి సరిగా పనిచేయుటలేదు. గృహనిర్మాణ స్కీములవల్ల ఎవరికి లాభిస్తున్నదో తెలియటంలేదు.

“ లాండు రెవిన్యూ విషయములలో ఘామిశిస్తువైన కొంత సర్పార్టి వేయాలని ప్రభుత్వం తలపెట్టుతున్నది. ఈ విషయములో K.L.P. పార్టీ ప్రతిఘటిస్తున్నదని నేను మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ఏ రైతు ఆదాయం ఏ ఏ పార్సితాలలో ఎంత వస్తున్నదో ప్రభుత్వం పరిశీలించాలి. ఈ సర్పార్టి వేయడమనేది రైతులు ఇదివరకే యిప్పుడు ఇవ్వ వలసిన వస్తును చెల్లించలేకుండా భుండగా ఇంకా యీ సర్పార్టి వారిమీద వేయడం అనేది రైతుకు యింకా భారము ఆధికము చేయడమే. ప్రజలు ఈ విషయమై చాలా ఆందోళన చేస్తున్నారు. గ్రామాలలో రైతులు అధిక ఖర్చులవల్ల కష్టముగా జీవనము గడుపుతున్నారు. సాధారణముగా 50 రూపాయల శిస్తు చెల్లించే రైతు చాలా నీడవాడు అనే తరగతికి చెందియున్నాడు. అటువంటివానిపై యీ సర్పార్టి వేయడం

10-15
a.m.

[Sri G. Latchanna]

[10th July 1952]

చాలా అధర్మము అని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ఈ రోజులలో ఇతరుల పాఠము దున్ను కొని కట్టపడి జీవించేదానికి ఏ విధమైన protection లేకుండా యిస్తుంది. ఇనాం రైతుల హక్కులను రక్షించుటకు ప్రభుత్వంవారు ఒక శాసనం చేయాలి. దరిమిలా ఇనాములను గురించి ఇటీవల ప్రభుత్వంవారు జారీచేసిన ప్రత్యేక ప్రభుత్వ పూర్వ విధానమునకు చాలా వ్యతిరేకముగా వున్నది. ఖామి దున్నే రైతుకు హక్కులు కలిగించాలి. ఇప్పుడు అమలులో వున్న ఖాస్వామ్యవిధానంలో మీదరైతు ఎన్నాళ్ళ కట్టపడి ఇల తరుఖామి కాలకుచేసిననూ, అతడికి ఖామిమీద హక్కు కలగడంలేదు. ఎప్పుడు మీదవాడుగానే వుంటాడు. గనుక అతనికి హక్కు కలిగించాలి. గనుక యీ విషయములో ప్రభుత్వంవారు పూర్తిగా పరిశీలించి ఒక comprehensive Inam legislation తీసుక రావాలి. గనుక ప్రభుత్వానికి వెన్నెముకవంటి రైతుమీద యీ అదనపు శిస్తువేయుట అధర్మంగావున, యీ శిస్తు ప్రభుత్వంవారు తీసివేయుట మంచిది. ప్రభుత్వ దృక్పథం హెచ్చుచేయాలంటే రైతునే బాధింపనక్కరలేదు. ఇంకా ఎక్కువవిధములు వున్నవి.

“ఇక బన్ను చార్జీల విషయములో బన్ను ప్రయాణీకులు సామాన్యముగా మధ్య తరగతికి చెందినవారే. ఇప్పుడు అమలులోవున్న చార్జీలు ఇప్పటికీ జాస్తిగావున్నవి. గ్రామాలలో ఈనాడు నివసించువారు రైతాంగానికి చెందినవారు. ఈ రైతులే ఎక్కువగా ప్రయాణం చేస్తారు. ఈ చార్జీ ఈ రైతుకు యింకొక అదనపు శిస్తు అని తలచవలెను. ప్రతి విషయములో రైతునుంచే యీ ప్రభుత్వ ఖర్చులు వివిధముగా నైనను వసూలు చేస్తున్నారు. ఈ అదనపు చార్జీ వసూలుచేయడం ఆక్రమం అని నా అభిప్రాయం గనుక ప్రభుత్వంవారు యీ విషయములో పూర్తిగా గమనించవలెనని కోరుతున్నాను.

“ఇక మధ్యపాన నిషేధం గురించి ఒక మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ఈ Prohibition department ఎత్తివేసి Police department కు అప్పజెప్పవలెను. అట్లుచేస్తే ప్రభుత్వ ఖర్చు కొంత తగ్గుతుంది. రెవిన్యూ బోర్డును ఎత్తివేయుటవల్ల ప్రభుత్వ వ్యయము తగ్గుతుంది. జిల్లాలలో కలెక్టర్లువుండగా వారిపైన గవర్నమెంటు Administration department వాటి Secretaries వుండగా యీ రెవిన్యూ బోర్డు post office మాదిరి ఉంటున్నది. కనుక ఈ డిపార్టుమెంటు ఎత్తివేయుట మంచిది. శ్రీ రాజాజీగారు ఒక్కొక్కప్పుడు ఈ రెవిన్యూ బోర్డు ఉండకపోతే ప్రజలకు న్యాయం జరగదని, ఉపకారంగా వుంటుందని అన్నారు. కొందరు ప్రముఖరాజకీయవాదులు యీ రెవిన్యూ బోర్డు అవసరమని అన్నారని వెప్పారు. ప్రభుత్వంవారు ఈ బడ్జెటు అంశాలలోని ఖర్చును తగ్గించవలెనని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను.

“ఈ సర్పారీ టెక్ గురించి దీనిని ప్రస్తుతము abolish చేయవలసిందిగా ప్రభుత్వాన్ని కోరుతున్నాను.

“ఇనాములను గురించి ఒకమాట చెప్పవలెను. Estates Land Act వచ్చిన తర్వాత యీనాముల గురించి వెనుకటి ప్రభుత్వం చేసినటువంటి Abolition Act యొక్క అమలు విషయములలో కొన్ని వ్యతిరేకపు తీర్పులు నా బోర్డు సుప్రీంకోర్టులు యిచ్చాయి. అట్టి తీర్పుల ప్రకారంగా ఈనాడు Rent Reduction Act లో కొన్ని లోపాలు సూచించబడ్డాయి. ఇటువంటివి నూటికి 60 గామాలు వున్నవి. ఇటువంటి పరిస్థితులవలన గ్రామాలలో civil and criminal litigation కు దోహదమైంది. ఈ విషయములో ప్రభుత్వంవారికి ఒక మెమోరియల్ ప్రజలు పంపియున్నారు. ఈ విషయములో ప్రభుత్వం దరఖాస్తుకోసం వలెనని కోరు

10th July 1952] [Sri G. Latchanna]

కున్నాను. ప్రజలలో ఆందోళన జాస్తి అయినది. ఇందుకుగాను ప్రభుత్వం ఒక Comprehensive Land Reforms Legislation తీసుకురావాలి. ఇటువంటి legislation వచ్చేలోగా రైతుకు భూమిమీదవున్న హక్కులు తీసివేయకూడదని ఒక తాత్కాలిక ordinance ను అమలుపరచాలి. ఇందు విషయము ఒక ప్రత్యేక కమిటీని వేయవలెను. మన దేశం ముఖ్యంగా వ్యవసాయ కేంద్రం కాబట్టి ఒక Expert Committee ని ఏర్పాటుచేసి భూభామందులుగాని, ఇనాంబాద్లుగాని, జమీందార్లుగాని రైతును భూమినుండి తొలగించకూడదనే తాసనాన్ని అమలులోకి తేవలెను లేని ఎడల వ్యవసాయ రైతాంగానికి తాంతుండదు.”

* JANAB K. M. SELTHI:—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is the view of the Muslim League Legislature Party that the Rajaji Ministry has made the best of a bad situation in producing this Budget and that this Budget deserves the sympathy and support of this House. Nobody was expecting surprises in a Budget produced by the Ministry, in the existing state of society and in the existing economy of the State. It was very easy for the Rajaji Ministry to succumb to the temptation of starving the nation-building activities when it was faced with a huge deficit of Rs. 4 crores. Really it speaks highly of the sense of duty and the sense of regard for the welfare of the people of the State that the Ministry did not succumb to that temptation but made ample provision for nation-building activities in the Budget. While in 1945, Rs. 10 crores were provided for nation-building activities, we have a provision of Rs. 43 crores in the present Budget for the same. Further, provision for recurring expenditure of Rs. 42 lakhs and non-recurring expenditure of Rs. 357 lakhs for new welfare schemes has been made in this Budget. All these are very healthy features of the Budget and it will be only fair for the House to support the Budget. 10-30 a.m.

“ While discussing the policy underlying the Budget, I cannot make any suggestion by way of any revolutionary change in the provisions of the Budget, because as a man endowed with ordinary commonsense, I cannot expect such a revolutionary change to take place. But what we have to see is whether the Budget has kept in view a progressive policy and the necessity for providing for the welfare of the citizens of the State. If that has been kept in view, this Budget certainly deserves the support of this House.

“ One thing to which I would refer in this connexion is the policy of Prohibition followed by this State. So much has been said about it and thanks to the vacillating attitude of the previous Congress Ministry towards this policy, a lot of unjustified criticisms have been heard from all quarters regarding Prohibition and unwarranted hopes and expectations are entertained by the people that Prohibition is, after all, going to be scrapped. What I respectfully submit to this House is that if this healthy policy which the Congress Ministry has adopted is given up, it will be a calamity for the State. It is very often said that Prohibition has brought about illicit distillation and that every house has

[Janab K. M. Seethi]

[10th July 1952]

become an illicit distillery. I submit it is a gross exaggeration of the real state of things. Illicit distillation was there even before Prohibition was introduced and it is not a novel feature which has come into existence because of Prohibition. Illicit distillation is there in spite of Prohibition and not on account of the Prohibition policy that has been followed by the Government. In fact, it is very often said that the policy of Prohibition was tried in America and that it was found to be a failure. Even that statement is not quite correct. I may state for the information of this House that there are two States in the United States of America, namely, Utah and Kansas, where complete Prohibition is enforced even now. Therefore, it is not correct to say that Prohibition has failed entirely in America. If two States have been able to successfully enforce Prohibition in a western country like the United States of America, here in Madras where the atmosphere for the enforcement of Prohibition is good and where the followers of important religions believe in the virtue of abstinence from intoxicating drinks, I submit it will be an unpardonable act on the part of the Ministry to give up Prohibition as a failure and succumb to the agitation that is now carried on by certain interested sections of the public in the name of the poor. It is an irony of fate that this demand for the scrapping of Prohibition is made in the name of the poor. As a matter of fact, Prohibition has done maximum good to the poor and it is only the rich and the higher middle classes, which have been indulging in a little bit of drink, that have been really affected by Prohibition. In asking for the collection of excise revenue from drink we are asking for tainted money, money tainted with the blood of the poor, and I respectfully request that this Government should not concede the demand for scrapping Prohibition. On the other hand, they should make Prohibition a success by taking suitable measures for its proper enforcement. In fact, there has been a lot of laxity in the matter of enforcing Prohibition. There were two acts of omission on the part of the Government in this regard. Firstly, the Government did not make adequate provision for the large number of people who were thrown out of employment by the enforcement of Prohibition. A number of questions were asked on the floor of the previous House about the ex-tappers who were unemployed. Government should have taken effective measures for securing them employment. I know in Malabar there are thousands of ex-tappers who are still unemployed. Of course, co-operative societies have been directed to be formed among these people. Sir, I represent a constituency where the illiterate ex-tappers are not able even to know that there is a provision for forming co-operative societies and that they will be enabled to tap sweet toddy for jaggery manufacture by forming co-operative societies. In this connexion, I have to state that the Co-operative department has to be a little more vigilant and helpful in such activities. They must give directions to the people and co-operate with them in getting these societies formed and registered. As a matter of fact, representations have been made to the Government by these ex-tappers that they should

10th July 1952]

[Janab K. M. Seethi]

be given some relief by way of employment; and the fact that they are still unemployed is one of the reasons why there is a big cry against Prohibition from different quarters. Secondly, I want to say one thing, and in saying that, I do not cast any aspersions on my colleagues or on the intelligentsia who have been agitating for the scrapping of Prohibition. I do not attribute any motives to them. But I respectfully say that their line of activity is really working as an adverse force against the enforcement of Prohibition. The public are entertaining some vague notions that, after all, Prohibition is not going to be enforced hereafter and even people who had abstained from drink and who were thinking that Prohibition had come to stay, are now entertaining vague hopes that the day will come soon when they can very freely drink, and revert to their old vices. I respectfully submit that the authorities are really not helped by that sort of criticism. Every one who speaks for the scrapping of Prohibition says drink is an evil. If they are really sincere in saying that drink is an evil, it is up to them to see that drink is annihilated in this land. Moderate drinking and progressive curtailment of toddy shops and things like that have been tried in very many places. Sir, I was a Member of a Legislative Council in one of the native States where a motion for Prohibition was brought in. Moderate drinking and progressive curtailment of toddy shops were suggested and we tried them in that State. But we found that those measures were absolute failures and drink was on the increase and the ideal of Prohibition was not served by that experiment. So, there is no point in saying, 'We do condemn drink, but adopt other measures.' There is no other measure to combat the evil of drink except total Prohibition and that policy has to be pursued courageously by this Government, whatever be the enormity of the revenue that we may lose on account of it. That, as I said, is revenue tainted with the poor man's blood and it will never help the State and we do not want it. That is my humble submission to the Government.

"Then, Sir, it is the duty of the State to increase the standard of living of the common man and liquidate illiteracy that is prevalent in the land. Illiteracy, unfortunately, is the great curse of this land. Only a very small percentage of our people has become literate by all our efforts hitherto. I do not know what our trouble really is. In many countries which began their educational reforms much later than our country, they were able to bring about universal literacy. So, a greater urge and drive for spreading literacy in this land are absolutely necessary and I hope the Rajaji Ministry will adopt some very healthy and effective measures in this direction. Sir, I represent a constituency which is really groaning under the weight of ignorance and illiteracy—Ernad and Walluvanad. These two taluks are notorious for illiteracy. It is said in some areas in those taluks, compulsory education is enforced. I submit that the enforcement of compulsory education has failed in those parts and more effective measures are necessary for enforcing compulsion. In this connection, I would support the useful suggestion that has been made

[Janab K. M. Seethi]

[10th July 1952]

by an hon. Member on this side of the House regarding the provision of midday meals in schools. Compulsion can be enforced effectively by supplying midday meals to the poor and helpless children who attend schools in areas where compulsory education is in force. There are many schools where compulsion is supposed to be in force but where there is poor attendance of boys and girls for the reason that they are not able to go to the schools for receiving education on account of their poverty and misery. If they get at least a midday meal, that will be a temptation for them to attend schools and compulsion in the matter of primary education will become a success in the State. I submit to the Government that the suggestion regarding the provision of midday meals to children in areas where compulsory education is enforced is a very useful one to adopt for making compulsion in the matter of primary education really effective.

“ While discussing the extent of the resources of the State for providing for various welfare schemes that the Government may launch upon, I would remind them of the lignite deposits in the State. While the Muslim League Party was sitting in the Opposition in the previous Assembly, it was brought very forcibly to the attention of the Government that the exploitation of lignite deposits in the Madras State should be very seriously and earnestly pursued, as that would provide an inexhaustible source of revenue to the State. I find some reports in the papers that the matter has been pursued by the Government. But my request to the Government is that greater earnestness and attention should be paid to that matter since it would help us to a very great extent in finding funds necessary for our welfare schemes.

“ As far as the district from which I come is concerned, that is, the Malabar district, we have a perpetual complaint that this district is almost always neglected in the matter of provision of amenities of a civilized nature. In the matter of good roads, hospitals and public welfare institutions, Malabar has suffered very much. In fact, we have very few roads which can be said to be really useful and serviceable. Most of the roads are kept in a very unsatisfactory condition and the construction of some of the important roads that was attempted has not been pursued. I have to particularly refer to the construction of the important Ponnani-Cochin road which urgently requires to be completed as early as possible. For the Malabar district, there was the Vipan scheme of road construction, but that scheme has not been implemented by Government. That scheme has to be resurrected and put into practice progressively by the Government in order to give relief to the people of Malabar in the matter of roads. There is also the need for some important bridges, and this deserves the immediate attention of the Government. For instance, there is the proposed *Chetuva* bridge near Choughat in South Malabar about which representations have been made. The Government must take immediate steps in the matter. Some hon. Members

10th July 1952] [Janab K. M. Seethi]

referred to the establishment of a Medical College and a Government Women's College in Malabar. Considering the high percentage of literacy among the women of Malabar, a Government Women's College for the district is an absolute necessity and the people have been asking for such an institution for several years in the past. This request has not so far been complied with by the Government. We have no hospitals and maternity wards in many parts of Malabar. Recently, the Malabar District Board asked for the opening of 24 Maternity and Child Welfare Centres. But, unfortunately, the Government turned down the proposal saying that the matter can be considered only subsequently and not during the present year. I have to regretfully state that as far as the Constituency which I have the honour to represent is concerned, there are several villages where we do not have any provision for maternity help and medical aid. People are therefore suffering for want of these elementary amenities of civilized existence. The recommendation of the Malabar District Board was very, very urgent and I would respectfully request that the Government might consider the proposal even now and review the decision they have taken. I hope and trust that it will be possible for the Government to comply with the recommendation of the Malabar District Board in that behalf and make the necessary provisions in the present Budget itself.

“ About the working of the agricultural department, I wish to say a few words. It has been the unfortunate lot of all of us to voice forth our grievances about this department on the floor of the House. The agricultural department is yet an institution which has no contact with the common man. This department is being kept up for establishing and maintaining certain agricultural farms which are said to be model farms for the public. As a matter of fact, this department is not serving the useful purpose for which it has been brought into existence. From the newspaper reports, the Government might have been aware that in the matter of food production, at no place including the district of Malabar, were the Government agricultural farms able to show any model scale of production. In fact, certain ryots were able to produce a record quantity of grains like paddy in their own private farms, while the agricultural department, with all its claims for a scientific system of production, was not able to give any model for high production and did not carry away a single prize awarded by the State for model production. As a matter of fact, the agricultural farms and the institutions maintained by the agricultural department are something like mere toys and show institutions which are kept up at huge cost without any benefit to the poor ryots. That department has not done adequate propaganda among the public for popularising the fruitful modes of agriculture or scientific methods of agriculture. As this has not been done, the people have begun to criticise that department. They are now even sceptic of the efficacy of the measures and mode of cultivation suggested by the agricultural department. That department has now become a mere show department which has

[Janab K. M. Seethi]

[10th July 1952]

really no contact with the ryots and which has not attracted the ryots by making useful suggestions for the benefit of the public. I respectfully submit that if the agricultural department has got any right to exist at all, it must make itself more popular among the public. It has to carry on a lot of propaganda among the public. Unless all-round propaganda is carried on by that department, that department has no justification to exist and it will be a waste of public funds to have that department. If that department has anything to suggest by way of model method of cultivation or scientific methods of cultivation, then they have to be made known to the public. It has to be done by propaganda, I mean effective country-wide propaganda, among the masses. If that is not done, the department has no right to exist as I have already said. It is a mere waste of public funds. Therefore I repeat that this department has to do more propaganda among the public and it should be more helpful to and co-operative with the ryots and the ryots must know that such a department exists for their welfare. Greater co-operation of the public should be enlisted by this department if at all it has any right to exist and that is what I have to state about that department.

“ With reference to the encouragement of education among the backward and minority communities, this Government have to do much more than what they have been doing till now. As far as the Muslims are concerned, in the Andhra Desa, the Muslims have certain schools where the medium of instruction was Urdu. As the mother-tongue of the pupils attending these schools was Urdu, naturally, the medium of instruction was made Urdu in these schools. For instance, in the secondary schools of Nandyal and Kadiri, the medium of instruction was Urdu all these years till it was changed into Telugu all on a sudden. The medium of instruction was changed in the face of public protest by Muslims and this has given a set-back to Muslim secondary education as far as these areas are concerned. I respectfully submit that the idea or the fad of regional languages should not be allowed to come in the way of a boy being given instruction in his own mother-tongue which will be the most effective mode of instruction to him. As far as Andhra Desa is concerned, where the condition of Muslims is very backward, especially in educational matters, such changes have brought about very adverse effects on the progress of Muslim education. In regard to the encouragement of instruction given in Arabic wherever there was a demand for it, the Government have been following a very unsympathetic attitude. As far as Malabar is concerned, there is a separate school for Moplah girls at Tirur, and all these years, the Government have not deemed it necessary or useful to appoint a Pandit for the teaching of Arabic in that school. Many complaints have appeared in the Press from time to time about the absence of any provision being made for instruction in Arabic. Arabic is one of the classical languages recognized by this Government and provided for in some High Schools; and the University also has made provision for instruction in Arabic in colleges. We do not know

10th July 1952] [Janab K. M. Seethi]

the reason why no provision has been made for instruction in that language in a school which is attended by a large number of Moplah girls and which is intended for the advancement of Moplah education. I submit that the Government should appoint Arabic and Urdu Instructors in all the schools where there is a demand for them. Greater sympathy should be shown to these educational institutions intended for these Moplah girls. While speaking on this subject, I must say I am thankful for a few scholarships that have been sanctioned by this Government for Moplah boys and girls in Malabar. But, considering the educational backwardness of the Moplahs in Malabar, there must be a much larger number of scholarships for Moplah boys and girls of that area. I hope the Government will not be unsympathetic in this matter.

“As I said, compulsory primary education has failed in its enforcement as far as Malabar is concerned. From my experience, I may state that the Government should make provision for mid-day meals in the schools so as to make compulsory education a great success. Then only the scheme of compulsory education will be attractive and will be considered by the people as a boon. There are places where the provision of mid-day meals has been very helpful in attracting large number of boys and girls to primary schools. In this connection, I would also respectfully submit that the amalgamation of the boys' and girls' schools in certain areas, as for instance in Andhra Desa, has created great inconvenience to the Muslim girls and Women teachers. There are complaints that this amalgamation which is not approved of by Muslims generally has worked great havoc on the advancement of Muslim education in those areas. There is another difficulty also which is experienced by these schools, and that is caused by the sudden and surprise visits paid by the members of the local boards to some of these institutions. A member of the district board would any day surprise a school by going into the school where there might be lady teachers and women instructors and such visits are proving very inconvenient and irksome to people who observe certain customs. I mean some habits of reserve and modesty in this land. I respectfully submit that this is being resented by the schools concerned and the Muslim public.

“Several acts of encouragement that were given to the Muslims in the matter of education in the past were taken away. For instance, in schools where there were a good number of Muslim pupils, they used to allow two hours interval on Fridays for all the students. This enabled the Muslim students to attend their Friday prayer. To make up for the extra time given for this interval, the authorities used to regulate the school working hours in a suitable manner, with the result that all the boys were given interval when the Muslim boys used to go for their Friday prayers and the latter did not suffer in their studies by the holding of the classes during their absence. A change has now been made with the result that the two hours' interval on Friday has been taken away and if any Muslim boy goes for prayers on that day, he will be deprived of his lessons as the school work will be going

[Janab K. M. Seethi]

[10th July 1952]

on in his absence. This is working as a great hardship to the Muslim boys. This is also working as an adverse factor in the progress of Muslim education.

"I am grateful to the Government for the provision of two lakhs of rupees as a special grant for the Malabar Tuberculosis Sanatorium. But, considering the large number of unfortunate people who are victimised by this disease in that district, I hope and trust that the Government will give more encouragement and greater support to this Sanatorium and to other measures that are taken to combat this fell disease. In this connection, I would also request the Government that the long-pending schemes of having a separate and suitable building for the Moplah Girls' school at Tirur and a Hostel building for the Malappuram High school should be implemented as early as possible."

11 a.m. * SRI P. T. RAJAN:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, the very eloquent speech of Mr. Latchanna was lost on me, though not completely. It has had this effect on me in that I am prepared to vote for an Andhra Province immediately on any condition subject to Madras City being retained in Tamilnad.

"Sir, I propose to deal with six items to-day, Education, the present economic condition of the State, unemployment, Prohibition, Irrigation and provision of drinking-water. I hope to make my remarks as short as possible because the time at my disposal is very limited, with one or two tit bits thrown in in between.

"Ever since the year 1920 when, Education became a transferred subject, every Minister has been tinkering with that subject and the department; and each Minister had his own pet scheme to put through during his regime. Education had lost its real purpose in this country. There was a purpose, no doubt and that was that the foreign ruler wanted efficient, willing and cheap subordinate servants, and our colleges and schools produced them. Later on, these centres became centres of indiscipline. Instead of imparting character to the students and making them become leaders and men of initiative, the educational institutions have merely produced a number of graduates who were good neither to themselves nor to this country. The educational system in this country needs radical reform and I hope the Hon. the Chief Minister, though not in charge of Education, will find his way to form a small committee consisting of such eminent educationists as Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar and others with a number of experts from foreign countries and revise the educational system, to make education a real and vital factor in the life of the people of this State.

"Sir, the economic condition of the country is getting from bad to worse. I refer especially to the pay of Government servants and the wages of workers. No doubt the factory worker is in a position of vantage when compared to agricultural labour. The salaries of the State Government servants differ very much from those of the Central Government and the salaries of employees of the local boards and municipalities differ from those paid to the

10th July 1952]

[Sri P. T. Rajan]

State Government servants. After all, the scales of pay should be such as will give them a chance to live and to live fairly comfortably. Here again, instead of trying to find palliatives for the economic evils, I hope the whole question will be gone into and, if necessary, measures that would cut across old rules and old customs, will be undertaken to improve the living conditions of the people.

“The problem of unemployment is becoming more and more acute; especially unemployment of the educated is getting from bad to worse. In recent years, there have been more graduates produced than can be absorbed in Government service and by private firms. If the Government do not tackle this problem, it will be a great menace to the safety and security of the State and those politicians who make politics a profession will find enough scope to play mischief. That should be avoided at any cost and I hope this item also will merit the consideration of the Hon. the Chief Minister.

“Coming to Prohibition, I have to refer to the fact that I am not a faddist. If Prohibition can be worked effectively, I should have no objection to it and in so far as it cannot be worked successfully, it is a loss to the State financially and otherwise. A referendum may be taken as to whether the people of this State like Prohibition or its removal. No doubt, votes can be had for it but how far the people will co-operate in working it successfully remains to be seen. I believe there is a proposal that a small committee might go into the whole question and make recommendations as to its continuance or otherwise. If so, I hope that committee will go into the question thoroughly and make recommendations in the very near future.

“The other two items that I said I would refer to are Irrigation and provision of drinking-water. I wish to refer to these two items in so far as they relate to my constituency. Sir, I represent a constituency which is in a very remote corner of this State. People there suffer from want of drinking-water. Ever since 1903, attempts have been made to supply drinking-water to that area but nothing has come out. I am told on reliable authority that a scheme which has been prepared by the Sanitary Engineer is under the consideration of the Government. I do hope that it will receive the early attention of the Government.

“The other item is Irrigation. Irrigation in Cumbum valley is subject to certain difficulties. Wild streams coming from the Western Ghats bring sand and block the channels which supply water to the fields. This question has been receiving the attention of the Government for the last thirty years. A number of eminent engineers—Chief Engineers and others—and also Ministers have promised to attend to this work. But nothing has come out so far. I would like to point out to the Government that something should be done. A remedy has to be found. Though water is available, the lands cannot get that water in time. I spoke to the Hon. the Minister for Public Works and he was good

[Sri P. T. Rajan]

[10th July 1952]

enough to say that he would pay a visit to the area and study the conditions for himself. Another Minister also is concerned with the subject and that is the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue. I hope their visit will take place in the near future. If they are convinced that there is need for immediate attention, let them attend to it. I will be happy to welcome both of them there and if they feel convinced what I have said is correct, let them do what they can to remedy the evils.

"I said, Sir, I would throw in one or two tit bits. The departments of the Government are supposed to maintain the prestige of the Government. Some departments, however, feel that they are above law and that their own prestige is something greater than the prestige of the Government, so much so they have brought the administration into contempt. I am not making specific charges against these departments now. I merely wish to draw the attention of the Hon. the Chief Minister to the fact that the departments of Hindu Religious Endowments and Rent Control require looking into by him. If I am in the wrong, if he feels after an enquiry that my statement in the Assembly is unwarranted, I should be glad to withdraw it and if necessary, even apologise to the departments concerned. On the other hand, if there is something to show that all is not well in the State of Denmark, I do hope he will take suitable action soon.

"Coming next to the Hon. the Chief Minister himself, I hear he is working for fourteen hours a day and he has no time for rest. It is well and good. But I should not like the Chief Minister of this State, especially at this particular juncture, to be a glorified Secretary. He should have nothing to do with files. He has got about twelve colleagues. They should be able to deal with their departments. (Interruption by an hon. Member.) I am not going to make any suggestions. My hon. Friend, if he wants, may make suggestions. What I am saying is that he has a number of colleagues most of whom are new to the work. That is not a sin. The Hon. the Chief Minister can guide them so that he may have enough time to look into other matters. His must be a directing hand and not one that writes notes or minutes. His time is too precious and I hope he will consider my suggestion for what it is worth.

11-15
a.m.

"Sir, there has been a good deal of controversy about his office. I feel he is not the Chief Minister of the Congress Ministry. His position is peculiar. At a very critical and difficult time he assumed office. He should be in a position to guide, help and direct the Members of this House, to whichever party they may belong. I have heard from my Friends on the right, the Communist friends, that they have nothing against him and they would like to have his guidance. I hope I am not wrong in making this statement. What they feel is that the Hon. Chief Minister is rather hard on them. I am inclined to agree with them."

10th July 1952]

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"They don't mind it at all. They flourish under that."

* **SRI P. T. RAJAN:**—"Sir, we have got a very big House and most of the Members are new to the work. We have got to create good traditions. The House is willing to recognise the vast and varied experience of the Hon. Chief Minister. This is not flattery. No doubt I have been subjected to any amount of criticism for having supported him. If I am to defend my action, that will take a long time and I will do it elsewhere. What I am saying now and here is that the position of the Chief Minister is a unique one at the present moment. He must not consider himself to be a partisan though he might head the Congress Ministry. He must be in a position to create healthy traditions in this House. Sometimes I find it very unpleasant to hear hot words exchanged between Members on either side. Anybody who visits this House should go back with the idea that the people of Madras have got sufficient parliamentary experience, that they can conduct their affairs, the legislative affairs, with dignity and ability. That is the impression that I would like any visitor to get. As I said, most of the Members of this House are new and they require someone to help them. I cannot think of a better person than the Hon. the Chief Minister himself. So I request him once more not to saddle himself with the routine work of the departments but to have a survey of the economic problem of the State, the educational problem of the State and the employment or the unemployment problem of the State and find not palliatives, but radical remedies for them so that it may be possible for the successors that occupy his seat to face the future with greater hope and courage."

"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am thankful to you that you have been pleased to give me 45 minutes but I close my speech now within 20 minutes."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member, Mr. Viswanatham, will now speak. (The hon. Member was not in his seat.) The hon. Member was under the impression that Mr. Rajan would finish only at 11-45."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I was really expecting this thing. By the very rapid and brisk manner in which Mr. Rajan was proceeding from subject to subject, I knew that he would stop. Some old experienced parliamentarians do like this. I am sorry Mr. Viswanatham is not here now."

MR. SPEAKER:—"At the conference of leaders of parties it was decided that Mr. Rajan should have 45 minutes, and it was expected that he would finish only at 11-45. Probably the hon. Member, Mr. Viswanatham, thinking that he would have to begin at 11-45, has left just now. He informed me before he went. (Mr. K. Vinayakam stood up in his seat.) I will allow the hon. Member ten minutes."

[10th July 1952]

* **SRI K. VINAYAKAM**:—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, with great trepidation I rise, for I am not very happy to receive this Budget from the hands of the Hon. the Finance Minister. As a student of public finance, I am likely to agree with Professor Hugh Dalton when he says that in any State, more taxes we have to pay, if we should become a democratic nation. But I submit there is a method of collecting the taxes. The burden of taxation should not fall upon the poor. The incidence of taxation should be so adjusted that the rich should be made to pay more and the poor should be made to pay comparatively less. When we apply this test to the taxation proposals that are now placed before us by the Hon. Finance Minister, I find they do not satisfy that test. Taxation should be so arranged that the pain of paying the tax should not be felt by the tax-payer. It should not be a matter of fleecing. It should be as painless as when you pluck a feather from the body of the bird. The proposals now made by the Government such as the levy of surcharge on land revenue, the levy of surcharge on bus fare and the betterment fee on lands, all these fall on the poor people only. Instead of these, I would suggest some other taxes like the death duty, tax on tea and coffee estates and such other progressive taxes. Our problem in the country is a problem of production rather than of distribution. There is a great inequality of incomes in our country and if production is properly tackled, there will be less of this trouble. Agricultural facilities are being given to the peasants in our State, but we find from practical experience that only the rich landlords get all facilities like the takkavi loans, loans for purchase of manures, subsidies for sinking wells, etc. All these are made use of only by the rich landlords. I suggest that in places like the Chingleput district where there are no major irrigation projects, electricity should be extended and the farmers should be enabled to use that power to grow more food.

" Sir, there are some public utility services undertaken by the Government, for instance, the bus transport in Madras. I am afraid the advisory committee appointed by the Government consists only of members who do not use bus transport at all in their lifetime and who will not be in a position to give constructive suggestions. For instance, my hon. Friend, Mr. Rajam Ramasami and Mr. Sambandam, who know nothing about bus transport and who are not likely to use the public transport in their daily life will not be competent persons to give the Government proper advice. So, I suggest if the Government mean real business, they should nominate members who really represent the population of the City who depend upon the public transport for their conveyance. I have already expressed my views on the policy of Prohibition and I once again reiterate that it should be immediately scrapped."

SRI C. RAJAM RAMASAMI:—" On a point of order, Sir, The hon. Member referred to me . . ."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—" Is it a point of order, Sir? "

10th July 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—"Without hearing the hon. Member, how can I say whether it is a point of order or not?"

SRI C. RAJAM RAMASAMI:—"The hon. Member referred to me and Mr. Sambandam as being totally incompetent to serve on the Transport Advisory Board. I fully deny the charge, because we are quite capable."

MR. SPEAKER:—"It is not a point of order."

* **SRI K. VINAYAKAM:**—"That is a matter of opinion and I should be given the privilege of holding that opinion."

"Mr. Speaker, Sir, the levy of special taxes on foreign liquor permit holders will lead to a great amount of smuggling of foreign liquor from places like Pondicherry. This is bound to happen whether you like it or not. I submit this kind of taxation will not aid you in your Prohibition policy."

"Sir, I am an educationist by temperament and I say the education policy pursued by this Government is anything but satisfactory. We have to liquidate illiteracy if we should deserve the Independence which we have won. But there are very few educational institutions, with the result that even the Hon. Speaker had the painful experience of recommending a large number of students for admission but with no effect because the educational institutions complain that they have not enough seats for the students. Especially students coming from the backward communities and Scheduled Castes are put to lot of trouble because they have no godfathers in the departments concerned. I have the privilege to belong to a backward community and I did not become a politician out of my conviction. We, graduates of the backward community, took to politics only to fight the issues in the Assemblies and Councils. Some of us, University men, longed to do some service to the State. We tried our luck with the Government departments. Finding that there was none to help us, that there was no scope for backward communities, most of us thought that our issue is not being fought well in the Assembly and Parliament, and so some of us got into politics, not by choice but by force of circumstances. If the Government want to tackle the rising tide of communism, which they are terribly afraid of, they should tackle the problem of the educated unemployed men. Nobody need be afraid of communism if the misery of the educated unemployed men that is lurking in the country is tackled well."

"Mr. Speaker, Sir, much has been said about the Andhra Province. I may bring to your notice that we Tamilians living in some parts of Chittoor . . ."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Let not the hon. Member include me also by saying 'we Tamilians.' Let the hon. Member speak for himself."

* **SRI K. VINAYAKAM:**—"I never meant to include you among Tamilians living in Andhra districts. We, some Tamilians

[Sri K. Vinayakam]

[10th July 1952]

living in Chittoor district, which is claimed to be part of the Andhra State, dispute that claim. We claim that Tamilnad extends up to Tirupathi. Chittoor was carved out as a district by the Britishers in 1911. Before this year, there was no Chittoor district. Six taluks from North Arcot district, such as, Tirutani, Puttur, Chittoor, Kungunthi, Kuppam and Palamaneri and three taluks from Cuddapah, namely, Kalahasti, Punganur and Vayalpad were formed into a district, viz., the Chittoor district, and a superannuated British official was put in charge of the district then. Therefore I place this claim before the House on behalf of Tamilians living in predominantly Tamil areas in Chittoor district, lest their case be disposed of ex parte, for want of proper champions of their cause."

11-30
a.m.

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the very first instance, as an old Member of this House, I must congratulate all my colleagues who have participated in this debate. Sir, you will agree with me when I say that the debate has been kept on a very high level and the speeches were very informative."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I may tell the Leader of the Opposition that 99 Members including the Leader of the Opposition, took part in the debate."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Thank you, Sir. I just sent word for that information. Including the Leader of the House, it will be 100 and the Leader of the House will be the centurion."

"It is a matter for congratulation not because so many of us could participate in spite of the time pressure upon us, but because of the high level of debate that has been maintained; personality has been eschewed and the whole debate went on merits. It is really a matter for congratulation and I hope the Leader of the House and the Hon. the Chief Minister who has been sitting patiently all along, will echo what I said. But, all the same, Sir, there is another aspect which I wish to bring to your notice. We are now the citizens of a Sovereign Democratic Republic. Most of the Members are new to this House and only 30 or 31 are old Members. And when they come here, they must be given an opportunity to represent their constituencies by fully and freely participating in the debate and frankly and exhaustively expressing their opinions on the Budget. The Budget is the one occasion, in fact it is the only occasion, when all Members have got an opportunity of speaking their mind. On Bills and other motions, only a few Members take part. But on the Budget, all the Members may wish to fully participate in the debate. In fact, during the last elections those of us whose names were fairly known had an advantage and some of the Members who had no opportunity to speak here were actually at a disadvantage and the people of their constituencies said, 'This gentleman went to the Assembly and he never opened his mouth'. Therefore, Sir, this is an important matter which must be taken into consideration. I know, Sir, you will be ready to say, 'In the House of Commons there are

10th July 1952] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

620 Members and all of them won't speak; seats are provided only for about 317 Members and even if all of them come, many do not open their mouths'. It may be so in the House of Commons in England: and England is different and particularly the temperament of England is different. But here, after nearly 200 years of foreign rule, we have just emerged from the general elections based on adult suffrage and the constituents do expect us to speak as well as we can. Discussion on the Budget is the one occasion during the year when the whole administration is reviewed. What is the remedy, Sir? The Rules of Procedure do not provide for sufficient time to us. I, therefore, suggest, Sir, for your consideration and for the consideration of the Leader of the House that our Rules of Procedure may be changed so that every Member who wants to speak might get at least half an hour. Every Member represents about 75,000 voters and he must have a right to speak at least for half an hour. After all, in half an hour very little can be covered."

SRI K. RAJARAM:—"Thirty days have been allotted including those for general discussion."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"I have been a Member of this House for some time and I know the difficulties. The rules of procedure are in the way, but we are not intended to be slaves to the rules. If the Members of a Sovereign Democratic Republic want to have more time for the general discussion of the Budget to make a review of the Government administration at least once a year, they must have it; my submission is that we might change the rules more or less on the lines of the procedure in the English House of Commons. You know, Sir, in England the whole Budget goes to a Committee of the whole House and that Committee considers it and then it is discussed in the open session for nearly 26 days; then the vote on account is taken prior to March 31st and then detailed discussion takes place in the Committee of the whole House; and again in the Committee of Ways and Means the entire Budget position is reviewed and the final date on which the Budget is passed is after 26 days of discussion in the open session. Even though our population in this State is as big as it is in England, we are not as many Members as there are in the House of Commons. Therefore, I submit that it should not be difficult for us to sit till August if necessary. At any rate we can certainly finish the Budget in July. We should satisfy the democratic urge in the minds of all the Members and the democratic urge in the minds of all the electors who have sent us to this Assembly and who want us to fully exchange our views in this House, so that things may go on more by discussion and consent than by mere majorities in a formal way. I commend this for the consideration of the Hon. Chief Minister. I believe you were also telling us of a Rules Committee for the revision of the rules and I wish to suggest that this matter also may be taken as one of the subjects for its consideration. If this is done, it will be possible for every Member to speak in this House. As a matter of fact, even ordinary

[Sri T. Viswanatham]

[10th July 1952]

meetings of companies and co-operative societies are not wound up unless it is known that every shareholder desiring to speak has spoken.

"There is one other matter on which I want to make an appeal to you and that is about the facilities in the House. You know, Sir, that Members come from several linguistic areas of the State. I am at a disadvantage when hearing a Tamil speaker. The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam is at a disadvantage when a Telugu Member speaks in Telugu. And when a Member from Malabar speaks in Malayalam, fourteen Ministers are at a disadvantage besides many hon. Members. May I therefore suggest whether it would not be possible for you, Sir, to arrange for simultaneous translations as it is being done in the United Nations Organization? I do not think it will be very difficult to do it and I put this before you for your consideration and for the consideration of the Hon. the Chief Minister.

"Then, Sir, I would like to say a few words on the relations between the Government party and the Opposition. If democracy is to function properly, there should be cordial relations between the Government and the Opposition. Otherwise, things cannot move on well. We do not like scenes or any such things. Of course, the Hon. Chief Minister gives several meanings when he says that the Opposition is bent upon chaos and that the Opposition is preparing for a financial sabotage. He might say sometimes in joke; sometimes he might say with one meaning; sometimes he might say with two or three meanings, so that one can escape with it." (Applause.)

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"The hon. Member is illustrating his own point, Sir."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Yes, Sir, I am illustrating my point. You might have observed, Sir, during the debates both on the confidence motion and on the Budget, how disciplined and docile the Opposition has been. Not one of us used any strong language; not one of us indulged in thumping tables or clapping of hands; not one of us obstructed the Congress Party Members from speaking. When a Member was speaking, he was carefully heard. No confusion was created; we are not after such things and we do not think like that. Therefore, Sir, I am submitting that here is an Opposition which does not deserve the remark that we are out to create chaos. You can judge us by the conduct here and by the conduct which the members of the United Democratic Front generally have been observing outside. I am saying all these because I want to show that we can get on cordially. After all, the first cloud of want of understanding has disappeared, and we are getting on well; we are talking to each other well; in the formation of committees, there has been some give and take and I congratulate the Members on the other side on this change and hope that more will be done in the future. When I refer to the 'first cloud of want of understanding', I might refer to the allotment of party

10th July 1952] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

rooms. You know, Sir, that I was pressing that we might be allotted a little more space. But the Government side were not willing. At that time, it was said, 'No; either you have the upstairs or the downstairs; you and we cannot combine'. That is the spirit with which we started. That has gone and I hope we will be given more space at least now.

"In this connexion, I might draw your attention and the attention of the Members in this House to what we said, that the party rooms must be allowed to be used by us throughout the year. I remember you were good enough to reply to my letter that our party can use the party rooms only for 15 days prior to the session and 15 days after the session. Sir, why should any invidious distinction be made against us and why should the Leader of the House think that as the ruling party, they have got a right to use their party rooms throughout the year and the Opposition party Members should not use the rooms throughout the year? I want to impress, with all the earnestness at my command, that this Government is a joint enterprise for the common good of the people, to be undertaken both by those who are in power and those who are in the Opposition. Unless that spirit comes into our blood, we cannot get on well and we may be committing several mistakes. And I request the Hon. Chief Minister and the Hon. the Leader of the House and all the Members that support me on this side also, to realize this aspect. It is not merely in the matter of allotment of party rooms which is an ordinary matter, but even in the matter of arranging Government Business, in discussing financial matters, industrial matters, irrigation projects, etc., there should be some understanding. When there is understanding between the Opposition and the Government, greater good can be done to the people and then there will be peaceful reign in this State. Then only there will be scope and opportunity for increasing the well-being of our people. There may be ideological differences between one group and another. But cordial relations on the floor of this House will certainly help a greater understanding and it will be the basis and the basement for the progress of this country. I am mentioning all these because there were certain matters in which we were made to feel that they are in power and we are not in power.

"Take, for example, the privilege motion I moved. You were pleased to say that there was a *prima facie* case of breach of privilege. I said then with all the clearness of language I possessed that once the Speaker was of the opinion that there was a *prima facie* case of breach of privilege, it would be the conventional duty of the Leader of the House to move, or ask some other Member to move, a resolution that the matter be referred to the Privileges Committee. But the Hon. Chief Minister did not do anything of that sort. Instead, passions were roused in and out. The Hon. Chief Minister departed from the parliamentary convention of referring the question of privilege to the Committee of Privileges. I submit to the Hon. Chief Minister that he should

[Sri T. Viswanatham]

[10th July 1952]

not entertain any such notion about privileges of Members for, as you know Mr. Speaker, it is not a party matter. Even if I belong to a party, consisting of one Member like my friend Sri P. T. Rajan and there has been a breach of privilege, the whole House must take it up, for the breach of privilege of a single Member of this House reflects upon the entire House. The question of privilege should not be treated on party grounds; it should be decided on its merits. Particularly when the Hon. Speaker was of the opinion that a *prima facie* case of breach of privilege had been made out, the Government ought to have, according to parliamentary convention, referred the matter to the Committee of Privileges. After the Committee had submitted its report, the House ought to have discussed it and voted on it. That was the proper attitude which the Government ought to have adopted towards the Opposition.

"The question of privilege will be generally raised only by Members belonging to the Opposition. The Members on the Government side may not raise the question at all; for they are satisfied that they are having their party in power. I know that some of them had the same trouble as myself on the day the order under section 144 of the Criminal Procedure Code was issued. Some of them had the same difficulty as ourselves in gaining entry into the Assembly Chamber. But they do not mind all the inconveniences caused to them. Because their party is in power, they do not mind the little thorns in their way. If privilege motions are not taken up and the Government do not concede the just demands of the Opposition, what happens is, even without the knowledge of the Government our democracy gradually tends to autochacy. That is why, to guard against such a tendency growing, the Opposition is always on the alert with regard to privilege and adjournment motions.

"In the matter of adjournment motions, I beg to submit that Government should adopt a more liberal attitude towards the Opposition. The Opposition in this State is not a weak Opposition but a fairly strong one. Even the Government party has no absolute majority in the House. Bearing all these things in mind, I hope the Government would adopt a more liberal attitude towards us, especially on motions of privilege and adjournment and particularly so when the Speaker rules that they are in order.

"Coming to the Budget leakage, I wrote a letter to the Leader of the House to allot a day for discussion of the same. When I raised it as a matter of privilege, you were good enough to observe Mr. Speaker, that it could be brought in as a substantive motion but not as a motion of privilege. Myself being a non-official, I could not get a day on that issue, unless the Leader of the House agreed to it. I promptly wrote a letter to him requesting the allotment of a day for debate. Till now, I have not received any reply. I know that the Hon. Leader of the House is working from morning till evening and that he is much worried. Anyhow he could have written to me either allowing a day's debate or saying he could not allow it."

10th July 1952]

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"The Hon. Leader of the Opposition should know that we are sitting till the 28th or 29th of this month."

* **SRI T. VISWANATHAM:**—"The Hon. Leader of the House started before I finished my sentence. I am glad that he has said at least this much. I simply said that he could have written a letter in reply either refusing or accepting my request for allowing a day's debate on the Budget leakage. He could have allowed us to have a debate on a holiday. For instance 11th is a holiday and he could have allotted that day. Why I say all these is because I repeat that breaches of privilege are very important matters and are intended to preserve the rights of the citizens of our country and the dignity of the House."

"Next, I come to the short-notice questions which hon. Members give notice of and the Government answer on the floor of the House. I gave notice of a short-notice question in the last session. It referred to a matter on which the Hon. Chief Minister need not get any information from the departments. It was a very simple matter and was to the effect whether the Hon. Chief Minister had made any statement about the Andhra Province and if so, what action he was going to take in the matter. The Hon. Chief Minister could have waived notice; but he did not do it. It was answered a month later. Then again I sent a short-notice question, as soon as the order under section 41 of the City Police Act was issued, asking the reasons for issuing that order. Still the question has not been answered."

"Very recently, I gave notice of a short-notice question. It related to a very ghastly incident that took place in Rajahmundry. Protest meetings were held and resolutions were passed by the people of Rajahmundry condemning the action of the police. An innocent girl aged eleven was alleged to have been taken into custody, and kept under custody for fifty hours without being produced before a Magistrate. Finally due to the ill-treatment meted out by the police, the girl became unconscious and she was found later in an unconscious state on the banks of the river Godavari. I hope the Hon. Chief Minister would have received a telegram. I simply wanted to know what action the Hon. Chief Minister proposed to take in the matter. The question could have been answered. How glad the people of Rajahmundry would have been to know the Government had not been silent over what had taken place and that they were taking action."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"As soon as I got the information about the incident, before this question was put, I sent for information. It was immediately followed by this question and I could not therefore answer because I had no information on hand. I have asked for details and as soon as they are received, before my hon. friend asks for it, I shall answer."

[10th July 1952]

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“I thank the Hon. Chief Minister for what he has just now said. It is already three or four days since that incident took place. I do not think that communication between Madras and Rajahmundry is so difficult as to make this delay to get details.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“Does the hon. Member think that I have the answer with me now?”

* **SRI T. VISWANATHAM:**—“No, Sir, I do not think the Hon. Chief Minister is having the answer ready at this moment. I know he has not got it. I wanted to put the question only to draw the attention of the Hon. Chief Minister to the cruel behaviour of the police against the innocent people of that locality. I just wanted to elicit information as to what happened. I am glad that the Hon. Chief Minister has sent for information. I sincerely trust and believe that we will get more information about this incident. My only object was to let the people know what action the Government proposed to take in the matter. The people of Rajahmundry have convened protest meetings. They have also sent a telegram. The Hon. Chief Minister has called for a report. The question was put only to infuse confidence in the people that the administration is going on on right lines, even though it may not be with the speed with which we desire it should go.

“I may be permitted to inform the Hon. Chief Minister that short-notice questions are intended to elicit information and from the replies received, confidence should be reposed in the minds of the people that the Government are moving in the right direction. That should be the spirit in which our democracy should work. There should be that sense of cordiality and mutual confidence between the Government and the Opposition. I submit therefore that these are things on which some understanding is necessary. I hope hereafter whenever short-notice questions are put, Government will not be miserly in waiving notice.”

* **THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:**—“I greatly appreciate what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said regarding short-notice questions. May I request him to understand that short-notice questions should be put only on matters of grave emergencies and for eliciting information and not for making debates. I shall never grudge giving information, but on debating points I shall never yield.”

* **SRI T. VISWANATHAM:**—“I know that the Hon. Chief Minister has never yielded and will never yield hereafter. I am sorry that he has conceded the right of the Opposition to bring in short-notice questions only on matters of grave emergency.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“Was my statement to the Press a matter of grave emergency?”

* **SRI T. VISWANATHAM:**—“Yes, Sir. It was a matter of emergency for Andhras. The new Chief Minister had just then

10th July 1952] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

taken over the reins of administration. It was a matter vital to the two crores of Andhras to know what the Hon. Chief Minister was going to do about them."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Let us not have a debate over this." (Laughter.)

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"I sincerely trust that rightly or wrongly, our Hon. Chief Minister will not repeat hereafter that the Opposition is here for only chaos. Let him not repeat that we are here for financial sabotage. I am not arguing, Sir. The Hon. Chief Minister may not say anything jocularly on debating points. But his words have a political effect. It is having an effect upon the Services. When a gentleman of his position—not an ordinary gentleman but one who had occupied the highest position in India—if that Chief Minister comes here and says that the Opposition is out for chaos, what happens? It has a tremendous effect upon the District Officers, upon the Heads of Departments and big officials. Will they freely talk to us? No, they won't. The moment the Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachariar said 'let not the non-officials go to the Heads of Departments' it produced a great change. The Heads of Departments who were anxious to know who were the Government Party Members and who were not, immediately reacted saying 'whether one is an M.L.A. or not, let no one come to us.' Hence I request the Hon. Chief Minister not to repeat such things, viz., 'that the Opposition is meant only for chaos' or anything like that. Why should the Chief Minister have the suspicion that he could expect only chaos from us? Why should the Hon. Chief Minister remark that the Opposition is Communist-dominated and is out for only chaos? The words of the Chief Minister are having a political effect. It produces suspicion among the people about us. The other day I was talking to an engineer. While I was talking, another engineer came and enquired of the other engineer what he was talking and why he was talking. I am only citing this as an instance to show the effect the Chief Minister's words produce. Perhaps the Chief Minister said so in a jocular way, but he should be aware of the big noise made over it outside.

"I am not against the Opposition being criticized, but not to the extent that we are out for chaos or anything of that sort. On the other hand, we are all fully alive, just as the Congressmen are, to our responsibilities. Time alone will reveal that the step we have taken in having integrated all the opposition parties into one was an act of great constructive activity. Time alone will justify our action. Simply because a particular group amongst us has a particular ideology, it is politically wrong to snub or divide the Opposition. I am not entering into a debate on this question now. I want to impress on hon. Members that we, the Opposition, are also Members of this House as the Congressmen are. We have also been elected to this House by the people's vote. I sincerely trust that the Hon. Chief Minister would take note of this fact.

[Sri T. Viswanatham]

[10th July 1952]

"I come next to the second remark of the Hon. Chief Minister that the Opposition are out for financial sabotage. Perhaps in the context in which the Chief Minister used it, that expression may be a mild one. But all the newspapers featured it. Suddenly people began to doubt whether there had been preparations for any looting of any bank. (Laughter.) When I asked the Hon. Chief Minister to give the definition of the word 'financial sabotage', he said that he would wait and give the answer. It should be remembered by all that what we talk here is talked about not only in our streets but the news goes 400 and 500 miles away. What will the people outside think of us? The common man in the mufassal thinks: 'What are the Opposition Members secretly planning at? What is the "financial sabotage" they are aiming at?' Such is the effect which the Chief Minister's words produce amongst the common people. Realizing this, I sincerely trust that the Hon. Chief Minister would not repeat such statements.

"Several questions were asked by some hon. Members on this side about the police atrocities in some parts of the State. Immediately the Hon. Chief Minister comes to the rescue of the police and says that he never believes in exaggerated reports. By making such statement, he gives in effect a *carte blanche* to the police.

"Just before I came here on the 27th June, an incident took place in Waltair. A sub-inspector there was having some dealings with the fishermen of 'Lawson's Bay.' There are about 500 houses in that locality. As is usually happening in several parts of our State, there was illicit distillation or drink near that place also. I was told that the sub-inspector was having a share in that transaction and that he also used to get money from the fishermen. One day the usual transaction took a different turn. It was said that the sub-inspector demanded more money and they refused. A quarrel took place. The sub-inspector used force. Of course, the fishermen used counter-force. The sub-inspector was beaten. The police took up the case. When a police officer and that too of the rank of a sub-inspector had been beaten, it was considered a big offence. All the houses in the locality were thoroughly 'searched.' Some innocent children, women and pregnant women too were taken out and beaten and asked to give information. The police people entered huts, drew out the children, drew out the women, drew out even pregnant women and asked them, 'Where is the man who beat the sub-inspector?' as if the man was to be found in all the five hundred houses, as if it was necessary to enter every house and drag out the people from there! Then what happened? Within forty-eight hours, more than half the village was empty; the village was practically evacuated; people fled away to the neighbouring villages. A swami who was living in that area went to the people who had fled away and told them everything would be enquired into and asked the people to return to their homes on that assurance. After three or four days, most of the people, through the efforts of the swami, returned to their homes. The Collector whom

10th July 1952]

[Sri T. Viswanatham]

I saw was good enough to talk to me; he did not say 'you are an M.L.A., therefore do not come to me' but he was good enough to talk to me. I told him that this was a matter which the District Magistrate should take up, for it was a matter involving police people, and however strict the District Superintendent of Police might be, unless the District Magistrate took up the matter into his own hands, things could not be set right and people in the villages would be terrorised. I have also instanced the Rajahmundry incident. Every day letters are coming to me stating how the police people are behaving. The fact is that they do not take interest in the ordinary kind of work; they are just seeing what the Minister is saying, whether the Police Minister is defending them or not. The previous Police Minister, we all know, was always defending every one of the acts of the police in this House; and the moment any remarks like that came from him, which had the effect of giving a *carte blanche* to the police, they began to think they could do anything and felt free to do anything. I submit the Hon. Chief Minister has got a great duty by the people of this State. I do not say that he should abuse the police people or take them to task on my word; I do not say he should punish the police people on *ex parte* statements; I do not say he should use words of threat or of abuse to the policemen; I only submit when complaints are made here in the House, let no answer be given here generally that 'it is all an exaggeration.' Immediately it is said, you must realize the sufferings and difficulties of the poor people, who are most of them fishermen,—particularly in connexion with cases of prohibition,—or Harijans or members of the backward classes; immediately you use such language, they are simply ill-treated, maltreated, assaulted and molested. I have given you the latest instance.

"I have also come to know of a case where a motor lorry was stolen; its number is M.S.P. 751; it was stolen on 7th February 1952. Until to-day, i.e., 10th July 1952, no enquiry seems to have been made; nothing whatsoever has been done and the lorry has not been found out. What does the complainant write to me? He writes that he actually saw the lorry in a particular man's house in Ponneri; and as soon as he saw it, he went to the police; he says he went and represented the matter to the sub-inspector of police; the name also is given here, and I shall tell it to the Hon. Minister later. He continues, 'if I go according to his procedure, then only he will seize the lorry and arrest the concerned party' and all that. So, this kind of thing is going on I got this letter only just now; I trust the Hon. Chief Minister also would have received a copy of it; because everybody in these days sends a copy of the petition not only to me, but I think to the Chief Minister, to the President, and to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru also; and I also think that because everybody sends it to everybody, therefore everybody throws it into the waste-paper basket and nobody attends to it. I do not know what the Hon. Chief Minister is going to do about it. But one thing; he must tell the

[Sri T. Viswanatham]

[10th July 1952]

police even now that they must be courteous to the people, that they must realize that India is now an Independent Sovereign Republic where everybody has got equal rights, that the police are there only to preserve law and order, and not to molest and assault the people, that it is not their birthright to molest everybody . . .”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“Is it right to charge them with all this? My hon. Friend is perfectly entitled to ask me and to ask my colleagues, ‘Be courteous, be just, be honest, be diligent,’ but he is not right in saying in the same breath that everyone is generally the opposite of all that.”

* **SRI T. VISWANATHAM:**—“So many cases have come to our notice. I have also studied logic; if it is stated for instance that men are liars, it does not mean that all men are liars; and so when we make a general statement like this in regard to the police people, it only means a good number of them.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“The very thing you attribute to them you should not commit; we should not suspect and condemn people without hearing them.”

* **SRI T. VISWANATHAM:**—“I have not condemned anybody; I only say that a good number of policemen do such things, particularly when the baton is put into their hands. That is why I said previously that although the police here may be Legislature Police, let them not have the baton with them. There is no use, Sir, the Hon. Chief Minister saying ‘do not say it generally of them.’ When I say it generally, I do not mean cent per cent, and general statements cannot mean cent per cent. Why should the Chief Minister think it applies to all? When I say that the police people must be told to be courteous, it does not mean that cent per cent they are discourteous; when I say they must be kind-hearted, I do not mean to say that all of them are hard-hearted. The Hon. Chief Minister must understand me only in that spirit. I am not here to condemn anybody; why should I? They are all of them my countrymen; they are in charge of law and order and they are given certain powers. I have at the same time given certain instances where they have not behaved well and if immediate action is not taken—even as in the case of the Rajahmundry incident no action was taken and the man was not immediately sent out of the place or at least suspended—what would happen, I want hon. Members to imagine. If no action is taken, naturally they will have the idea that they can get on in the manner they are doing. The police atrocities of 1949-50 are said to be the result of no prompt action having been taken against the concerned officers in the Katuru affair. If any complaint is made in the House, we should not be told ‘On this ground, how can the Government take ex parte action?’ I want the Hon. Chief Minister to give a new orientation to the policy adopted by Government in regard to this matter. He can frame his sentences in his own

10th July 1952]

[Sri T. Viswanatham]

language, so that there may be no general condemnation of the whole police force; but all the same, there must be some sort of re-orientation in the policy, and he must make the police people understand—not a few of them alone—that they have got a particular duty towards the people of this country.

“Coming now to the question of new taxes, I believe, Sir, that almost everyone who has spoken, except perhaps two or three hon. Members, almost everyone from both sides of the House has disagreed with the new proposals; some of them actually condemned them; some of them suggested alternate proposals; and some of them said that these taxes were unnecessary. I do not want to go into details now, for the Bills relating to these taxes are not now before us; but I do hope that the Government will take all this criticism now made into their consideration before they actually introduce the Bills, and that they will modify the provisions by that time in view of the present criticism. I accordingly reserve my criticism on the incidence of fresh taxation to a later date when we will have the Bills actually before us, and I shall content myself now with saying that any fresh tax on the people at this stage is absolutely unwarranted, and that it will never be appreciated by the people, whatever my friends on the other side may say.

“I also submit that our deficit is only a make-up deficit; I do not think that any deficit which may be there need be taken notice of. I may illustrate it by saying that the Annual Financial Statement was presented to us already on the 3rd March 1952 by the then Finance Minister. This statement was presented to us on the 27th June last. Let us see what the estimate of receipts was at that time and now. Under the sales tax, for instance, in March 1952 they estimated a receipt of Rs. 16.25 crores; and in between that date and June 27th when this revised Budget estimate was presented to us, what has happened? During these three months, we all know the slump was there, as it was prior to the 3rd March, and there has been a fall in wholesale prices—and that was the case even on the 3rd March—and that is why the Hon. Mr. Shetty on the 3rd March referred in his speech to these things and said that because of these causes, there might be a decrease in our revenue under sales tax. So, he put the probable revenue at Rs. 16.25 crores, but now we find in the present Budget that even that figure has further been reduced to Rs. 14.50 crores, I want to know on what basis this further deficit of Rs. 1½ crores has been arrived at. (The Hon. Sri C. Raigopalachari: ‘Actuals’.) My hon. Friend says ‘actuals’. They are after all only preliminary accounts; the actuals will be known only after three or four months. We have only the ‘preliminary accounts’ in June; there may be recoveries and amounts may have to be adjusted, and that is why the preliminary accounts are prepared. I therefore submit that so much shortage in income as Rs. 1.75 crores need not be shown in the Budget now. Again, under stamps, they foresaw in March last that we would have a shortage of Rs. 44 lakhs. The transactions have not ceased all on

[Sri T. Viswanatham]

[10th July 1952]

a sudden, they continue to go on as before the 3rd of March 1952; and yet, we find that the decrease in income under this head is estimated to be 44 lakhs. Then again, I find they have put in lump-sum provisions of Rs. 60 lakhs in two places under Irrigation and Grow More Food Schemes. The Hon. Finance Minister himself will agree that these lump-sum provisions are not wholesome. It is true the previous Government did it; they expected the elections to come off in 1951 and so in 1950 they put in lump-sum provisions; but the elections came off only at the end of 1951, and so they put in lump-sum provisions of—not one or two lakhs, mind you—Rs. 60 lakhs under one head and another Rs. 60 lakhs under another head. I submit, Sir, if there are no estimates and if there are no demands, if the engineers do not want the amount and the departments themselves do not want it, what is the meaning of putting in these Rs. 120 lakhs? At any time when you want money, you can come to this House with a supplementary demand. (The Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachari; 'You encouraged it.') The Hon. Chief Minister says that I encouraged it. With great respect, I may say there is some confusion about it. Creating a separate fund is altogether different; a fund which may be replenished year after year is different from allotting Rs. 60 lakhs as lump-sum provision under Electricity or Irrigation or Highways. I do not of course want to dig into the past, but I may say it was a device of a Ministry which felt diffident if they would come back; that is why perhaps they put in lump-sum provisions so that they might not come before the House once again, and they might be utilized for whatever purpose they pleased. (Laughter.) By this means the Irrigation Minister then wanted to satisfy the Finance Minister and the Finance Minister wanted to satisfy the Irrigation Minister. Thus, the shortage foreseen in March 1952, has increased in June 1952, to the extent of Rs. 175 lakhs plus Rs. 120 lakhs and about Rs. 40 lakhs under other minor heads, resulting in a total of Rs. 3 crores and odd. Sir, I submit I was in charge of a small municipality—which is not of course like a big Government. But the ways of the Secretariat officials, the ways of accounting in the district boards and municipalities are practically the same. They have all got the same training, the same orders to go upon, the same Budget months and the same rules; and they all do the same thing, viz., foreseeing less of income, demanding more money for expenditure, and in the end finding that no schemes are taken up and executed at all. If only the new Members of this House will please look into the various columns of the Budget estimates, they will find several blank spaces under 'Preliminary accounts.' At the time of presenting the Budget, Mr. Rajagopalachari or the Finance Minister has to satisfy Mr. Ramaswami or Mr. Viswanatham or somebody else who may be very insistent, and in order to satisfy them, some provisions are shown but after the year is over, the column will be a big blank. Therefore I say, we know how the income is foreseen to be less, how the demand is foreseen to be more and how at the end of the year no expenditure is shown to be incurred at all and then how they can come with a supplementary Budget before the

10th July 1952] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

House for schemes which they had taken up during the year without the knowledge of the Legislature and have it all carried by the majority which they always command. These are things, Sir, which I submit the Hon. Chief Minister must carefully look into.

" Sir, I gave you only three items from which you can see that all these three items go to make up the deficit. In that view also I think the alternative taxes are unnecessary. Apart from foreseeing the loss on account of evasion of sales tax, if any hon. Member on the Government side, who does not agree with the fact that wholesale evasion of sales tax is going on will only go to a shop, he will know what is really happening. Most of the Members know—perhaps the Hon. Chief Minister has no occasion to run up to a shop—what the shopkeeper does. The cost of this article or that article is Re. 0-15-2 and so on. The man who purchases the articles from the shopkeeper runs away immediately because he has to catch a bus and what happens is, the shopkeeper does not give the bill. If at all the purchaser insists on the bill, he has to pay the sales tax. Otherwise, the shopkeeper does not write out the bill, because the purchaser is in a hurry to catch the bus. " Then, Sir, the Income-tax department also is cheated and therefore our share of the income-tax is also lessened. So, Sir, why not tighten up the collection of sales-tax? I also understood that a number of coffee hotels have come up even beyond the licensing limit, not only in the City of Madras, but in all important places. In fact, when there was rationing, most people begin to live in coffee hotels only. So, Sir, if you tighten up your department and if your Commercial Tax Officers are vigilant and if that department is properly purged of corrupt people, I say you can collect nearly 3 to 4 crores of rupees. In fact the estimate by one Chamber of Commerce was that if the sales tax collection is done properly, you can get as much as Rs. 7 crores more. I say even that may not be realizable, because there are many loopholes everywhere. But, still, I say you can collect Rs. 4 crores more. I am submitting that not only the deficit can be wiped out, but you can also get more revenue.

" Again, Sir, the Hon. Mr. A. B. Shetty in his Budget speech told us that Rs. 8½ crores under revenue was spent on capital works. I submit, Sir, that it is not a wise policy to spend so much on capital expenditure from revenue account. After all, capital works are only intended for the benefit of the generations to come. Capital works of such a magnitude which absorb Rs. 8½ crores should only be undertaken from borrowings and not from revenue account. Therefore, Sir, if you do not spend money on capital works from revenues, if you tighten up the sales tax department and ask your officers to be very strict and also purge the department of the corrupt elements, I am sure you can get Rs. 3 or 4 crores more. Yesterday, Sir, Mr. Jayarama Reddi and also Mr. Muthiah Chettiyar suggested alternative taxes. I am not in favour of alternative taxation. In my opinion, no taxation is necessary.

12-15
p.m.

[Sri T. Viswanatham]

[10th July 1952]

“ Let us now look at another thing. We are now compelled to keep our funds in securities. I understand that there is a loss of about one crore in 1951-52 and 1952-53 on sales of securities. To get our own money from the Reserve Bank by the sale of securities, we have to lose one crore of rupees. The Hon. the Chief Minister was telling us that we should thank the Reserve Bank for the accommodation shown to this State and for having given us overdraft. What is the good they have done? They have given an overdraft. But, do they not collect interest on the overdraft? What is the legislation under which the Reserve Bank was constituted in India? It is its bounden duty to accommodate us. Yet it does not accommodate us. It asks us to sell our securities in the open market, because the confidence in the Government was completely shaken and in two years the loss on account of sales of securities went to the tune of one crore of rupees. Therefore, Sir, I submit that if you take all the figures and facts into consideration, no new taxation is necessary. I only hope that the Hon. Finance Minister who is now having discussions with the Finance Commission, will come to the conclusion that no further taxation is necessary and that taking into account the subventions and grants that the Government expect from the Central Government before July 31, these unwanted and unpopular taxation measures will not be brought in and thus he will also save the people from worry and his own party from some unpopularity.

“ Sir, I do not wish to take up much time. The Budget speech began by saying that the Government have taken credit for certain measures in respect of famine. No doubt people were glad that in respect of famine areas the Government took immediate action and they did something. But the demand from our side—not only from our side but also from the Government side—is, ‘please do something which will prevent recurrence of famines.’ I think in 1937-38 when the Hon. Mr. Rajagopalachari was the Chief Minister of this State we were faced with a big famine and a large amount had to be spent. I suggest that instead of spending large amounts for unproductive works every three or four years, Government should do something for Rayalaseema, so that these famines may not be a recurring feature. You know, Sir, certain recommendations were made by the Famine Enquiry Committee which was constituted in 1938-39, I think, under the presidency of the late Mr. T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar, they made some valuable suggestions. I hope that Government will take all these things into consideration and if necessary take into confidence the Members, those coming from Rayalaseema in particular, and arrive at measures which will give permanent relief to Rayalaseema. The sooner it is done the better.

“ Then, Sir, afforestation is one of the measures which I would suggest in respect of Rayalaseema. Rayalaseema is denuded of all forest lands. Except the Nallamalais which is shown as forest land, vast extents of forests have been denuded. Some say that

10th July 1952] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

trees bring rain and others do not agree with it. There was some forest officer who wrote in an article that trees have nothing to do with rains. Why did he say that? I do not know. If there is greater denudation, there will be greater loss of humidity and therefore water vapour that is condensing into water drops again gets reconverted into vapour and goes in the form of a cloud; but if there is humidity, clouds are attracted and water droplets are formed into rain and fall on the earth. Sir, there was a time when Rayalaseema was considered as the centre of wealth in South India. Did not some Portuguese writer say that in the whole world Rayalaseema was the centre of wealth and prosperity and the seat of one of the greatest of kingdoms? Then, why should it become poor now? Because we did not afterwards follow any policy; or because the previous Governments did not follow any policy, famine conditions prevail. Not only Rayalaseema is suffering from famine conditions; even the Mettur reservoir is not filled up and also the Pykara is not filled up. Even the Nilgiris is now denuded of trees. So, Sir, I want the Government to see that vegetation is not removed in this heartless way, in order that we may get a temporary benefit for ourselves and leave the future generations in the lurch. Let us have not only our interests at heart, but also the interests of our sons and grandsons.

“ Sir, the Government have also taken credit for decontrol. I submit that I was one of those who always pleaded on the floor of this House for decontrol. I do not believe in controlled economy, so far as rice is concerned. Everywhere rice is produced in large areas interspersed by vales and dales all over the State. Many crores of persons are involved in production and it is humanly impossible even for the most honest of men to procure it correctly and distribute it correctly. In its wake, control brought in only corruption. When the Hon. Sri Rajagopalachari was the Governor-General, he was pleased to come to Visakhapatnam and I, as the Chairman of the Municipal Council of the place, had the privilege of presenting a welcome address to him, in which I told him that decontrol must be undertaken. Of course, at that time he was of a different view. Now, I am glad that the God who is in him, in me and in the people, had told him that decontrol must come. All right, he has taken credit for that particular action. Even in regard to the zonal system, he has taken credit for himself. It is like the fight between two scientists in Germany; one scientist claiming the discovery for himself and the other saying he was the first to discover. In fact, I had been pleading for the zonal system and the records during the last three years will prove it and both the hon. Dr. Rajan and the hon. Mr. Roche Victoria will bear witness to the fact that I was pleading for the zonal system and, even if controls cannot be completely removed, I submit that this zonal system is the second best. I always said, ‘combine the twelve Telugu districts into one zone and then there would not be much work for the Government.’ Then you could divert all imports from outside the State, Orissa and Central Provinces to the

[Sri T. Viswanatham]

[10th July 1952]

south so that your administration might become easier and transport easier. On this point, I have to say something. There is some trouble about prices here in the south. I was really wondering why it should be so. What happened was this. The Hon. Chief Minister may know that 4 lakhs of tons of rice was locked up under Government orders in West Godavari and in the surplus districts. Under an outmoded theory the Government say that when there is a deficit they would release the stock. What is happening is, people are going to West Godavari which is called the granary, but this granary is not able to release the stock. Therefore we are short by 4 lakhs of tons of rice. The people are going there again and purchasing from producers on payment of one or two rupees more. So, the purchasers pay higher rates, bring it here and sell it at higher prices. I submit, therefore, that the Government should look into the matter. There is no use locking up the available rice in the godowns and then saying that prices are shooting up. Unless therefore you release the stock in the godowns, the prices may not come down. In my district, for instance, the ordinary price of rice is lower than the control price and it is cheaper and it is cleaned rice. As stated by Mr. Venkatanarayana Dora, in areas like Salur, the price for a measure is Re. 0-6-6 whereas in Visakhapatnam it is Re. 0-8-6 and it is so because of shortage of railway wagons. In this connection, may I request the Hon. Minister to get into touch with the Railway department and ask them to give us more wagons? All your policy of decontrol will be nullified if the Railway department do not co-operate. In fact, we had that difficulty in 1948-49 when wagons did not move and so even the available rice was locked up in certain places as a result of which people had to starve. Therefore, I submit that Government should get into touch with the railway authorities and ask for wagons for easy transport of foodgrains. If not, they have to be taken in lorries. Sir, lorry charges come to Rs. 3 or Rs. 4 per bag, whereas the railway charge is about Re. 0-12-0 per bag. That accounts for the difference in price which the consumer at Visakhapatnam has to pay. May I ask the Hon. Chief Minister to examine whether he cannot control the transport rates by lorries so far as foodstuffs are concerned and restrict the lorry rates to the level of the railway rates or impose a particular tariff and ask them to charge at concessional rates when rice and other foodgrains are under transit?

“Then, Sir, I come to another point. It was suggested by an hon. Member yesterday, that this Budget has given a new orientation. I ask, what is the new orientation that this Budget has given? Has not the centre of gravity shifted from the higher classes to the middle classes and the poor? Only yesterday when asked for statistics about the landless poor, the Hon. Minister replied that the time taken to collect the statistics will be too much and that it would be waste of time. I submit, Sir, that that attitude must go. It was true that when the English people ruled us here, a few of us had the right of franchise.

“May I know, Sir, whether I can take half an hour more?”

10th July 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—"The programme has been changed. At first, it was thought that Mr. Rajan might take 45 minutes and then the Leader of the Opposition should have been called, but since Mr. Rajan concluded his speech in about 20 minutes, the programme had to be changed."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"I will not take more than ten minutes; I shall wind up. There will be many other occasions for us to tell the Hon. Ministers what we have to tell them. Mere speeches on the floor of this House may not be of great use unless we have a persuasive tongue to convince them in a single pithy phrase, which all of us are not capable of. 12-30 p.m.

"The attitude of the Government must change. They must no longer say that it will be a waste of time to collect statistics. When we ask for statistics about poor men, middle class men and agricultural labourers, I say the Government must take all necessary steps to get the information. A shift in the centre of gravity has taken place. Why do not the Government realize this? Those who did not realize this fact were washed out in the elections. As a matter of prudence, it is necessary for the Government to know where the centre of gravity lies. Let us not say anything which will not be in the interests of the lower middle classes, the poor and the unemployed.

"Credit has been taken for the grant of educational concessions. I understand that in the whole of the Tiruchirappalli district only 771 students are benefited by this concession. In other districts too, the position would be about the same. The Government must have a larger vision and take a more liberal view in this matter. I understand that in the States of Hyderabad and Mysore, education up to the secondary stage is free to all children, whether they are children of Government servants, teachers or others. If small States like Hyderabad and Mysore can run their administration on this basis, I wonder why our Finance Department cannot prepare a Budget on the same basis. If only some of the non-official Members are taken into confidence, we shall certainly help the Government to bring about this result. Middle classes, lower middle classes, poor classes, poor landlords, poor pattadars, exservicemen, employees of Co-operative institutions—in fact all people are now complaining about their condition. The Government have not changed their attitude towards these people. It is necessary for them to change it and pay greater attention to them.

"One of the most outstanding problems not only in the City of Madras and big towns but throughout the State is the problem of housing. I say that the housing of the poor people, whether they belong to the Harijan Community or other Scheduled Classes or others, is a primary charge upon the revenues of this Government. Unless the Government create a separate portfolio for housing, not for distributing the existing houses among their favourites, but for increasing the number of houses . . ."

[10th July 1952]

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ This is insinuation.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ I do not insinuate. I am only describing what was done and this is termed as insinuation.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The hon. Member should give up this habit.”

* **SRI T. VISWANATHAM** :—“ If the Hon. Chief Minister had been a Member of this Assembly during the last five years, he would have realized that what I said was a mild description of what was happening. Why should I insinuate? I ask the Hon. Chief Minister to do things now. I will forget the past.

“ The Government should have a housing policy. In many municipalities, there are slums. Particularly Harijan quarters are very bad and the poorer section of the people are living in very bad and insanitary conditions. The Madras Corporation has borrowed Rs. 30 lakhs for clearance of slums and some slides depicting slum clearance work are exhibited on the screen in cinema houses. I wonder whether the Government are satisfied with that. They must do it more seriously. Next to food, housing is the most important thing. For the prosperity of this State, I submit that the housing problem must be tackled. A separate ministry for housing should be set up as in England. In England there is a separate ministry for housing set up after the establishment of the Labour Government. Month after month, our Legislature Library is getting reports about the progress of housing schemes in England, Scotland and Wales.

“ To get our co-operation, I suggest that the Hon. Chief Minister should constitute Standing Committees in various departments. I know that the Hon. Prime Minister of India said that Standing Committees were outmoded. When I have got a comfortable majority of 388, everything is outmoded. When my word carries weight by the show of hand and not by the use of reason, everything is outmoded. If the Government is to run smoothly, it is necessary to have Standing Committees, particularly for reviewing big schemes whose cost run into several lakhs of rupees. Very few people know the details. I doubt whether all the Ministers are aware of even the major aspects of the various irrigation schemes, except perhaps the Minister for Public Works and the Minister for Finance who go into the plans and estimates. I ask how many Ministers had known the structure and design of this House designed by that great Consulting Architect who has been pleased to give us so much heat and sun so near the sea coast. At least for reviewing schemes costing more than Rs. 10 lakhs or Rs. 15 lakhs, there must be a committee composed of the representatives of all parties. They must have an idea of what is happening. That the Estimates Committee will be a parallel Government is the argument advanced against it. I hope the Hon. Chief Minister has now, after three months, become more democratic-minded than he was and that he will not use such an argument. I submit that a Standing Committee will not be a

10th July 1952]

[Sri T. Viswanatham]

parallel Government or a parallel Finance Ministry. The members of the committee will be interested in the progress and well-being of the State and the proper expenditure of the finances of the State, and they will make very valuable suggestions.

"I submit that in all that the Government do, they must make the people feel that Swaraj has come. Some big men in India and the 375 Members of this House have been feeling that since August 1947 Swaraj has come. We fought and got Swaraj for the people. But have we given it to the people? No. We must take immediate steps to establish Swaraj for the people. The village swaraj must be there. Unless powers are decentralized and the people trusted, unless the people are made to feel morning and evening that they are enjoying the fruits of Independence which was obtained after a great and hard fight for thirty years, the Government will go the way of the previous Governments. Governments may come and Governments may go, but only the name of him will remain who gives back to the people what was got for the people. Let us as self-sacrificing persons give power to the villages but not under the present Village Panchayats Act. The panchayats under the Act have no independence; they are all under the thumb of executive officers who will always be looking to Madras for instructions. We want real *grama swaraj* and self-sufficiency in villages. Let the Government reorient their thoughts and measures so as to make the people feel the pride of Swaraj."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The Hon. Minister will reply to the debate after lunch."

The House will now rise for lunch and meet again at 2-30 p.m.

(After lunch—2-30 p.m.)

MR. SPEAKER:—"This morning the hon. the Leader of the Opposition said something about procedure, which is not correct. It is not the intention of the Chair to interfere in the debate. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition said, regarding privilege motion, that when the Speaker said that it was a *prima facie* case, at once the Leader of the House should stand up and accept the motion. That was not the case. The Speakers in England guard themselves by saying that the question raises a *prima facie* matter of privilege. Simply because the Speaker has stated that it is a *prima facie* case, it does not mean the House should accept it. The final authority in coming to a conclusion whether it is a breach of the privilege of the House is not the Speaker, but it is the House. In this connection I wish to quote from Sir Gilbert Campion, now Lord Campion. He was Clerk of the House of Commons for over 30 years. When he retired, he was raised to the position of a Peer, and he is now a Member of the House of Lords. In 1948, the 'Daily Mail' characterized the Members of the House of Commons as traitors and secret agents. The matter was referred to a Committee of Privileges. Sir Gilbert

[Mr. Speaker]

[10th July 1952]

Campion was asked to give evidence, because he was considered a living authority on parliamentary privileges. Mr. Grenfell put the following questions to him:—

Q.—Is not a ruling of the Speaker that it is a *prima facie* case tantamount to an instruction that the matter should go before the Committee of Privileges?

A.—‘No not an instruction. If Mr. Speaker rules that there is *prima facie* case, what follows from that is that it can be debated then and there and take precedence over the Orders of the Day. The House could deal with it on a motion on the spot, declaring it was or was not a breach of privilege; but in most cases if there is a question of doubt, it would be referred to the Committee of Privileges.’

Q.—‘A division of the members present would decide it?’

A.—‘Yes’.

The House should not go with the impression that it is the Speaker that decides the case, but it is the House that decides whether a matter is a breach of privilege or not. The House is the final authority.”

(The hon. the Leader of the Opposition wanted to see the official report of his speech.)

MR. SPEAKER:—“I knew that the hon. Member would contradict me. I am now reading from the official report. The relevant portion is:

‘The question of privilege should not be treated on party grounds: it should be decided on its merits. Particularly when the Hon. Speaker was of the opinion that a *prima facie* case of breach of privilege has been made out, the Government ought to have, according to parliamentary convention, referred the matter to the Committee of Privileges.’”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“May I explain, Sir? I never said that the Speaker's decision was final. When the Speaker says that it is a *prima facie* case, that by itself shows that it is not final, but it is the House that should decide it. I simply stated that the Government, which necessarily had got the majority, should adopt the parliamentary convention of moving a Privilege Motion and refer it to the Committee of Privileges. That is all that I said. I never wanted to create the impression in the mind of the Hon. the Chief Minister that I had any wrong idea, that the Speaker should decide immediately that it should go to the Committee of Privileges. I only said that as an indulgence to the Opposition, the Government, who always had a majority, should adopt the parliamentary convention . . .”

MR. SPEAKER:—“The words the hon. Member used are ‘ought to’.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“I said the Government ought to adopt the parliamentary convention. Sir, if we refer to May's Parliamentary Practice, page 363 or so, we will find that it has invariably been the practice in the House of Commons since 1902 or so to refer the question to the Committee of Privileges, when once the Speaker is of the view that it is a *prima facie* case of breach of privilege. That is all that I said.”

10th July 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—" I must also say that in the olden days it was the Chair that decided questions of breach of privilege. Now they have changed the rules."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—" In Delhi the rules have been changed. The Speaker has reserved to himself the right of referring the matter to the Committee of Privileges straightway."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—" May I waste another minute, Sir? The whole mistake and the difference of opinion and the difficulty to understand one another arise out of one fact that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition seems to think that generally, if not always, privilege motions come from the Opposition. The opposite of it is the case. Privilege motions come more often from the Leader of the House than from the Leader of the Opposition. If that bias be removed, he will see that what the Speaker has explained is the correct position, and there can be no difference of opinion. It is a distinction without difference to say that it is not an instruction. The real fact is that ordinarily the Speaker's decision should go without any further question. But where the Opposition attack the Government as a whole, the rule comes into play, and the House has to decide it. But, anyway, I do not wish that it should become a debate."

MR. SPEAKER:—" My object is that every Member should know the procedure regarding breach of privilege. It is only for that purpose I intervened in the debate. The Hon. the Finance Minister will now reply to the debate."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, before I proceed to the various points raised by hon. Members during the last six days, I would like to express my deep sense of gratitude to this House for the kindly reception it has given on the whole to the Budget proposals. I offer my thanks to hon. Members who gave their generous support and also to those who made constructive criticisms. But my special thanks are due to those who opposed the Budget from A to Z, because in my view in a democratic Legislature they also serve who stand and oppose. It is my conviction that a strong and effective Opposition is necessary for an effective, efficient and good Government. One of the great weaknesses of the previous Government, in my humble opinion, was the lack of a strong Opposition. When that strong Opposition is not there, the Government, in my view, becomes weak. Therefore, I welcome a strong and effective Opposition in this House, and I echo the sentiments expressed by the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition that Members of the Opposition are as much an integral part of this House as the Members on the Treasury Benches and others behind them are. In this connection, I would like to tell the hon. the Leader of the Opposition that I am much interested in a strong and effective Opposition. But there is a party, the ideology of which is to claim all the privileges and rights of the Opposition in a democratic Legislature for as long

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

[10th July 1952]

as they are in the Opposition, and once power passed into their hands, they would like to liquidate the entire Opposition and create an one-party dictatorship. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition took objection to the use of the word 'chaos' in a certain context. It is not as if all the Members on the other side want chaos. As a matter of fact, as the Hon. the Chief Minister put it, they are more orderly than Members on this side. They care for decorum and they follow the rulings of the Chair more implicitly than anybody else. But it is not the temporary phase of orderliness with which we are concerned. We are concerned with the ideology of a party which is wedded to the establishment of a dictatorship—it might be of a class—not by legitimate and peaceful means, but by force and violence. It is one of the items of their programme to achieve that objective, that there should be 'chaos'. There should be grievances and there should be everything which would weaken orderly Government in any country. Therefore, when a reference was made to chaos, it did not refer to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition nor to Mr. Adityan, but it referred to those who are wedded to this programme of violence and force and the establishment of a dictatorship.

(Sri T. Viswanatham at this stage passed on the programme of the United Democratic Front to the Leader of the House.)

"It is not there in the programme of the United Democratic Front. He refuses to understand what I am referring to now. In his heart of hearts he knows that what I refer to is a fact which cannot be disputed. I am not accusing the United Democratic Front, as it is functioning here. I have nothing to say about its programme. It has been put forward as the minimum programme. But I am referring to the ideology of a party which is wedded to violence and which is out to establish a dictatorship by force and violence. Therefore when I refer to it, let no hon. Member imagine that I am casting any reflection on such of those as are in this House or for the matter of that on those outside this House. I am referring to an ideology for which they are working through this House and through other activities outside also. Let it be clearly understood that when we say 'chaos' we do not mean any reflection on the Members of the Opposition as such in this House, but we refer to the chaos which is inherent in the very ideology of the Communists."

2-45
p.m.

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"On a point of order, Sir, I thought the Hon. Minister would make a passing reference and, therefore, I did not like to interrupt him. But I would like to point out that there is no question of the Communist Party functioning here, as he himself admits."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"That is a fallacy the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition is always labouring under."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"The Hon. Minister says that I am labouring under a fallacy. It is much better that he and I labour under the common fallacy. With regard to the common

10th July 1952]

[Sri T. Viswanatham]

minimum programme, I would like to point out that all the Opposition parties have combined and formulated a common programme. What we have written herein is 'On assumption of office, take the following executive and legislative measures . . . ' This is the programme and it will be quite in order if the Hon. the Leader of the House confines himself to the programme which we have placed in his hands, instead of referring to ideologies with which this House at present has no concern. Even the Communist Party of India, after assumption of office by the Hon. Sri Rajagopalachari here, has not said anywhere that they are wedded to a violent revolution or chaos or dictatorship of the proletariat. If, on the other hand, the Hon. the Leader of the House and the Hon. the Chief Minister have got any evidence with them, we will be glad to know it, for the Members are here and they will be in a position to explain or contradict it rather than allow these statements to go by repetition. And, fater all, repetition will not make a statement correct."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"Sir, I am glad the Hcn. the Leader of the Opposition is able to speak not only on behalf of the United Democratic Front Members here but also on behalf of the Communist Party of India."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"On your behalf also!"

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"None will be happier than I to know that Communists have given up their creed of violence, and their idea of establishment of a dictatorship by violence, but that is quite a different thing. None will be happier than I, if not only by profession but in action also, at the present juncture and in the future, they show to us that they mean what they say. I do not want to labour this point any more.

"The hon. Member Sri T. Nagi Reddi, I think quite legitimately, pointed out the difficulties of the Members in participating in this debate on the Budget. He complained, 'We are not able to understand these Budget proposals which are full of facts and figures, printed on so many pages and we find it difficult to know what is what and where any facts or figures are to be found for the purpose of understanding them.' I very well realize the difficulties pointed out by him. As a matter of fact, as soon as I assumed office as Finance Minister, I instructed the Finance Department to prepare a comprehensive note which would be helpful to the hon. Members of this House to study the Budget and understand it and I wanted that that note should be printed and circulated, if possible, before the discussion on the Budget began here. But the hands of the Finance Department were full in revising the Budget proposals in accordance with our directions and, in fact, they are only half-way through that note. But I can assure the hon. Members that the note will be completed and I will have it printed and distributed to the hon. Members at the earliest possible moment.

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

[10th July 1952]

“ One other factor which the hon. Member Sri T. Nagi Reddi mentioned was this. He said, ‘ The Budget is introduced by the Government and then we are asked to discuss it within a few days. Is it possible for anybody to digest these Budget proposals within so short a time and make a criticism which would be an effective criticism? ’ ”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—“ And which would be helpful to the Government.”

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“ There also I agree with the hon. Gentleman. But he should realize that we were rather peculiarly situated this year. General elections intervened and an interim Budget was presented by the Care-taker Government. As soon as we assumed office, we had to make revisions as far as possible, and present a revised Budget to this House. Before the new Constitution came into force, the constitutional position was that the Budget proposal for the coming financial year should be debated upon and even voted upon by the 31st of March. But now there is a change in the provision with regard to this. A provision has been made in the Constitution that there could be a vote on account. So much so, it is not necessary that the entire Budget should be passed before the 31st of March. After voting on account, it could be leisurely taken up and debated upon in the months of April, May and June. But as I already stated, we were peculiarly situated this year because of the intervention of the general elections and also after the first general elections, under the transitory provisions of the Constitution, the previous Legislature continued to be in existence till this House was summoned. Under those circumstances, we could not do any better than this and this House also had to be under all these disadvantages. But next year there will be time enough for every hon. Member to go through the Budget liesurely, make a complete study of it and make proposals which would be helpful to the Government and also which would be helpful to throw out the Government, if necessary.

“ One other matter that was mentioned was that this Budget was too complicated and that it should be a little more simple, so that even an ordinary layman could understand it. Unfortunately, Budget-making is not such an easy process. It is a somewhat complicated process. We have inherited the tradition of the past in framing the Budget and it will not be very easy to depart from that. But let me assure the hon. Gentlemen on the other side that, as far as possible, it will be my endeavour, if I continue to be in this office, to simplify the Budget proposals so that they may be made as less complicated as possible.

“ Sir, during the discussion of the confidence motion, I made a reference to the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition and said that he was a creature of circumstances. He took very great exception to it; but I confess, Sir, that as far as I am concerned, in framing these Budget proposals, I was a creature of circumstances.”

10th July 1952]

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—" And all of us are no doubt creatures of circumstances."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—" Sir, I was saying that I was a creature of circumstances in framing these Budget proposals as I had no clean slate to write upon. It is not as if writing upon a clean slate has advantages only. Writing upon a clean slate has its advantages and disadvantages also. So, I had to take the situation as a whole. I could not possibly ignore what all happened in the past as I could not overlook the existing conditions and circumstances. So, under those circumstances and within the limited time we had at our disposal, we had to revise the entire Budget framed during the last year by the Government which was in office then. The preparation of the Budget is not made overnight. It is a continual process. As a matter of fact, as soon as one Budget is completed, the process of compilation of the next year's Budget starts again. I had that disadvantage also. In addition to that, I found that I had assumed the office of Finance Minister at a time when the returns from the various taxes were falling and when the reserves which had accumulated during the war years had almost been depleted, though it might be that they were utilized for good purposes. But the fact was that I had to face a situation wherein the taxes were not yielding as much as they were expected to yield. Take the sales tax, for instance. It was growing year by year but it has now reached almost the maximum point; it has turned the corner of increasing yield and has begun to fall. The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition made a reference to the sales tax and said that we had underestimated the income from that tax. I will presently refer to that aspect of the matter, but the fact to be faced by me was that there was no longer a growing return from the sales tax. On the other hand, I found a definite turn for the worse and I had to take particular note of that aspect of the situation.

" In addition to these, as I have already mentioned in my Budget speech, there were two other factors which faced me. One is the all-important famine condition which prevailed in many parts of the State, not only in Rayalaseema but also in Guntur, South Arcot, North Arcot and many other districts . . . "

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—" It is continuing also."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—" I agree. But when I had to frame the Budget, I had to take note of these circumstances.

" The hon. Gentleman Sri Ramamurthi is always accustomed to make speeches and run away at the time of reply. I am sorry on this occasion also he is not here to hear the reply."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—" I am here."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—" He is always represented by some other Member (laughter) and that seems to be his

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

[10th July 1952]

way of dealing with the matter. There are some people who are always fond of delivering speeches and then running away. It is the duty of a Member not only to speak but also to hear.

“ Sir, the hon. Gentleman Sri Ramamurthi referred to the fact that ‘ the Finance Minister is interested only in the Budget, he is sorry that his revenues have become depleted because of famine conditions, and he is not concerned with anything else ’. Yes, Sir, as far as the Budget proposals were concerned, I had to take note of the revenue side only, the financial side only. That does not mean that I have no human heart. That does not mean that I am not interested in the famine conditions existing in almost all parts of the country. I am as much distressed as the hon. Gentleman Sri Ramamurthi, if not more. He referred to the relief measures adopted by the Government and said, ‘ They are all half-hearted measures ’. It was mentioned by various other hon. Members also that ‘ it is merely an eyewash. ’ Sir, I did not have the advantage of being present in the House when Sri Ramamurthi delivered his speech yesterday. That was unavoidable because I had to be present elsewhere. The hon. Gentleman said that gruel centres in Cuddapah had been closed down. I was wondering whether, as a matter of fact, any orders had been passed by inadvertence to close down the gruel centres. Therefore, I had to ring up the Secretariat through my Hon. Colleague the Revenue Minister and this is the information I have received now—

‘ No orders have been issued for the closing down of gruel centres. Only one gruel centre at Ravadrug in Bellary district has been closed down. The Collectors have been told to use their discretion and close down gruel centres when the attendance falls very low, that is, below 20. ’

Sri T. NAGI REDDI:—“ On the basis of a telegram that was received only yesterday and that too to an hon. Member here who is representing Cuddapah, my hon. Friend Sri Ramamurthi made that statement. Now, according to the Hon. Sri Subramaniam, Collectors have been given the discretion, and probably the Collector used his discretion to close down gruel centres. ”

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“ Sir, I want the hon. Gentleman to note the condition attached to the discretion. ‘ Collectors have been told to use their discretion and close down gruel centres when the attendance falls very low, that is, below 20. ’ Ordinarily in a gruel centre, about 400 or 500 persons are fed. The average attendance is that. But if it falls below 20, that means that there is really no need for the gruel centre in that locality. It can be very well closed down in that case. ”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—“ But those 20 persons will feel hungry. ”

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“ I agree. But I want to point out that the discretion given to the Collector is circumscribed by the condition that the gruel centre can be closed down if the attendance falls below 20. Even then, he is given

10th July 1952] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

discretion to continue it. There are a large number of gruel centres throughout the State and the following are the numbers in each district:—

Name of the district.	Number of gruel centres.
Anantapur	395
Kurnool	75
Chittoor	623
Cuddapah	470
Nellore	73
North Arcot	84
Salem	49
Coimbatore	31
South Arcot	7

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"Is it the latest information?"

3 p.m.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"Yes, this is the latest information available. Under these circumstances, we do not know from whom those telegrams have been received saying that all the gruel centres have been closed down and that there was great panic everywhere and all those things. We should be a little careful in all these matters and should not place too much faith in these telegrams. Perhaps, certain interested parties have given those telegrams and one should be careful when making an accusation or a statement on the floor of this House. A statement has been made that in Cuddapah, the gruel centres have been closed down. I got the text of the speech of the hon. Member Sri Ramamurthi and went through the same to find out whether he has given any figures in regard to this matter. He has not given any figures, but has only made a general statement that in Cuddapah gruel centres have been closed down, giving an impression that there has been a wholesale closing down of the gruel centres in Cuddapah. It is not fair to the Government nor is it fair to anybody to make such a statement. When the hon. Member made a statement, he should be able to give figures as to how many centres have been closed down and under what circumstances they have been closed. He should not be content with making a general statement. As far as the Government are concerned, we have issued instructions that as long as there is necessity, these gruel centres should be run, whatever might be the cost of running them. Therefore, I can assure the hon. Members of this House and particularly the hon. Members coming from the famine-stricken area of Rayalaseema that these gruel centres will be run as long as there is necessity for them. The instruction given to the Collector is that when the attendance falls below 20 he may exercise his discretion and close down that particular centre. The relief work also will be carried on as long as there is necessity for it and as long as famine conditions exist.

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

[10th July 1952]

It was mentioned here and elsewhere that contractors have misbehaved. I concede that some contractors might have misbehaved here and there. But it is wrong to make a general statement that the entire system of entrusting the work to contractors was bad. Wherever it was found that contractors misbehaved, the Revenue Department has taken up the work itself and the Public Works Department also has taken the work upon itself and they have run these relief works in such instances."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"That is not the case always."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"Yes, it is not possible for the Departments to intervene in all cases. Wherever it is possible, it has been done. I do not say mistakes would not have been committed. Wherever there were mistakes, and they were brought to our notice, we have rectified the same. In large scale relief works like these, there will be some mistake somewhere. But there is a class of people who always feed upon the misery of the people and take advantage of the misery of the people even when giving relief to famine-stricken people, and try to make a few more rupees. That is really an unfortunate state of affairs and the sooner it is ended, the better it will be for the country.

"In regard to loans, the hon. Gentleman Sri Ramamurthi criticised our policy, and when he referred to takkavi loans, he made an accusation that these were given only to the large pattadars. I do not know on what basis he made that statement. That loan is distributed to all the ryots there and 95 per cent of them are small ryots and not big ryots. That being the case, I do not know why he made that statement. He has not quoted, anything in favour of his argument, but has quoted himself. Sir, these loans are being given to all the pattadars. Whatever it is, I wish to tell the hon. Member that the loans are being given not only to big pattadars, but to all landholders, however small their holding may be. If it is only a matter of giving these takkavi loans to large pattadars, then there is no point in giving the same. So, Sir . . ."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"On a point of order, Sir, the Hon. Minister was telling that the hon. Member Sri Ramamurthi was quoting from his imagination when he said that these takkavi loans were paid to big pattadars. It is wrong. I think I am entitled to raise a point of order to correct the Hon. Minister. Sir, I will now read from the book entitled 'Speech of Sri C. Subramaniam, Finance Minister, presenting the Budget for 1952-53 to the Legislative Assembly and Council', wherein the Hon. Finance Minister has himself stated that 'the grant of takkavi loans was liberalised for the support of the larger pattadars.' It is therefore wrong on the part of the Hon. Finance Minister to say that the hon. Member Sri Ramamurthi was quoting from imagination when he said that these takkavi loans were given only to large pattadars. With a view to correct the Hon. Finance Minister, I have raised this point of Order, Sir."

10th July 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—"It is not a point of order. The hon. Member has been here for the last 12 to 15 years. I think he must know that it is not a point of order."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"I am only trying to enlarge that right, Sir."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"When there is a famine like this, not only the small pattadars, but also the larger pattadars are under distress, especially when there has been a continual drought in the last 4 or 5 years. I did not say 'larger landlords'. I only said pattadars. We felt that it was necessary to give relief not only to small pattadars but also to larger pattadars, of which class also the other side claims to be the champion. That is why I said that these loans were liberalised for the support of the larger pattadars, whose need for these loans is also as great as that of the small pattadars. Therefore, it does not mean that we are interested only in the larger pattadars and we do not care for the smaller pattadars. On the other hand, we have been granting these loans to all those who need them, because of the unfortunate circumstances existing there. Simply because a man has got a larger holding, we cannot deny assistance to him. As a matter of fact, in view of the continual drought in the past 4 or 5 years the need of some of these larger pattadars has become greater than that of the small pattadars, and it is our duty to go to their succour and help these people as well, along with the small pattadars. On this account, you cannot make an accusation against us and say that we are only giving aid to the larger pattadars and are neglecting the smaller pattadars altogether. It is an unfair accusation and an unfair statement made on the floor of this House."

"Sir, there is one other matter which causes some concern and that is the handloom industry. As far as I could see, this problem is not going to be solved as long as the conflict between the mill industry and the handloom industry exists. We are not going to solve it by giving a subsidy now or by finding out a small foreign market. By these means we are not going to solve the problem. This can be solved only if we solve this conflict between these two industries. Therefore it has to be tackled wholesale and not piecemeal. I don't claim to say that whatever we may do now in this matter will be a permanent relief and will put this industry on a permanent footing. This is a temporary measure that we have taken at present to meet a temporary situation. As far as this problem is concerned, the Government are prepared to go the whole way, whatever may be the cost of the scheme. But, as the handloom industry has to exist and survive so that the 50 lakhs of people in our State may find an honourable occupation to maintain their families, this conflict between the handloom industry and the mill industry should be ended; and that could be done only by reserving certain useful varieties which should be woven purely by the handloom industry. There should be a complete ban on the mill industry to weave any variety of cloth

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

[10th July 1952]

in that sphere. By adopting that method alone, we can solve this problem. It should be our endeavour to bring about that situation when this conflict could be ended. I expect the co-operation of the hon. Members not only on this side, but also on the other side in solving this problem.

“ Sir, I have been listening to the debate in this House for the last six days. I wish to tell this Honourable House that the Finance Minister is not only a tax-gatherer, but also the custodian and guardian of public funds. He has got to see that priorities are allocated wisely and expenditure is incurred wisely, so that there may be no waste. It is also the duty of the Finance Minister to see that the maximum return is obtained for the money that has been spent. I may state that I gladly welcome any criticism from the other side pointing out to me the various fields where there might have been a wastage of public funds and where we might not have been getting the maximum return. I should also welcome suggestions to stop that leakage. As a matter of fact, I expected that the hon. Members on the other side would do these things and suggest ways and means in this regard. But everybody was only pleading for more and more expenditure and most of them were speaking only from the political side.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—“ I have given some suggestions.”

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“ Of course there are certain honourable exceptions like the hon. Gentleman. The general trend of the debate was for asking more and more expenditure and for avoiding fresh taxes as far as possible. I think I am entitled to ask for the co-operation of this House in the very necessary duty of the Finance Minister to see that no waste takes place and that the maximum return is obtained. This could be done not only by the watchfulness of the Treasury Benches, but also by the hon. Members on the other side. I can assure the hon. Members on the other side that whatever may be their criticism in this respect, I will gladly welcome it. As far as I am concerned, I will be prepared to take such criticisms. It is only in that way we will be able to meet all our necessities in nation-building activities. As far as the State Government is concerned, all the nation-building activities have to be undertaken by the State Government. In the Constitution, if we see the division of the functions of the Central Government and the State Governments, we will find that all the nation-building activities for the welfare of the people are with the State Government. Allocations have been made with regard to taxation also. The resources also have been divided, but in that division we find that all the rich resources have been reserved for the Centre and only the residue, residue in the sense that whatever is left over after reserving for the Centre, is given for the State. The Centre reserves to itself all the rich and flexible resources and only very few taxes have been left over to the State Government. The only flexible source that the State Government has is the sales tax. As far as

10th July 1952] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

land revenue is concerned, it is almost a definite and fixed thing. But for the first time, we are attempting to make a departure now. I will explain that a little later.

“Formerly, there was the tax on liquor; but now we have got Prohibition and we cannot get much from that source. The other field is taxation on motor vehicles which too is not exclusively a State subject, but is a concurrent subject. In certain respects, if we tax motor vehicles, we have to get the concurrence of the Centre. Thus, our sources of taxation are very much circumscribed and therefore we have to depend on the Centre for their subventions, grants and loans for our various activities. If we have to get the maximum from the Centre, it is not going to be got by offensive speeches on the floor of this House. I am sure we can obtain maximum results by negotiation and by persuasion and I hope with our Chief Minister as head of the State, we will be able to get the maximum from the Central Government for the development of our State.

“Sir, I always take the view that Government is not an end in itself. It is one of the social institutions necessary for the welfare of the people. It might be the premier social institution with very great and vast powers; But still it is a social institution intended for promoting happiness among the people and it is only for this purpose of promoting human happiness that Government functions. The State was a Police State until recently. But now the conception of Government has been enlarging and the concept of a Welfare State has come to prevail all over the world. So much so, it has now become the responsibility of the Government to see that conditions exist in the State in order that people are properly fed, properly clothed, properly housed and are given proper education. It is the duty of the State to see that proper sanitary conditions exist and that proper medical treatment is given to the people whenever they fall sick. All these functions have fallen upon the Government; and as far as I am concerned, I am prepared to say that it is the responsibility of any Government to see that these requirements of the people are met. And if these requirements are to be met—these essential requirements—the money does not come from heaven or from outside sources. Only the people have to contribute to the Government, so that the contributions may be utilized for the common welfare of the people. Therefore, if we want all these extra activities, additional activities, and expanded activities to be carried on by the Government, we must provide the necessary money. The concept of a Welfare State is widening and widening so much, that the Government are obliged to find greater and greater resources and all these resources have got to be found only from the people and nowhere else. When I say, this, I know that it should be obtained in accordance with the capacity of the people to pay. You will find, Sir, that in the present taxation measures, we have taken into account the capacity of the people to pay. As I have often pointed out, the richer resources have been taken away by the Centre: and, we are left only with the sales tax. But fortunately, it is a very equitable tax. It is a tax paid by the

3-15
p.m.

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

[10th July 1952]

people according to their capacity. The poor man goes and purchases according to his capacity. Therefore, he pays sales tax proportionately on that. The rich man purchases more and therefore, pays more tax. Therefore, this is an equitable tax and that is why it has become the main source of State revenue now.

“ Sir, in making proposals for fresh taxation also, I claim we have taken this factor into consideration. When I deal with each taxation measure, I shall try to briefly deal with this aspect. After making our Budget proposals, I found that, as far as I could see, there was a deficit of $3\frac{1}{2}$ crores of rupees. The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition said that we had purposely manipulated the deficit. He used the word ‘manipulation’; for what purpose he said we manipulated? ‘Here is a set of wicked people who want to tax poor people, people who are already suffering. They have manipulated the accounts to show a deficit in order further to burden the poor people.’ Sir, are we so wicked as that? Leave alone wickedness. Are we so foolish as to go on burdening the people with taxes? Taxation is never a popular measure, whatever may be the necessity for it. Let me tell the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition who is not here”

MR. SPEAKER:—“ The Leader of the Opposition is here.”

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“ I am glad he is here. Let me assure the Leader of the Opposition that there is absolutely no manipulation. He says that sales tax has been purposely under-estimated. He asked: ‘On what basis have you put this figure Rs. 14·5 crores? It should be Rs. 16 crores and so you will have 1·5 crores more.’ We have taken the various trends into consideration as far as possible in framing the Budget. For my part, I studied it as an ordinary human being would study it and as an ordinary new Finance Minister would study it and then only estimated the revenue from sales tax at Rs. 14·5 crores this year. Let me tell the Leader of the Opposition, I will be more than satisfied if the estimated amount of tax is realized during the current year.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—“ On a point of personal explanation. Sir, it was said that the word ‘manipulation’ was used by me. I never used that word (The Hon. Sri Subramaniam: ‘You have said it and I have also made a note of it here.’) I never said that Mr. Subramaniam manipulated the accounts. I am not so bad as that. The Hon. the Finance Minister will please hear me when I say that the tax was put at Rs. 15·1 crores in the month of March. That is, the Government budgeted in the month of March for Rs. 15·1 crores. Even under the preliminary accounts we see we have got Rs. 15·58 crores. That is why I said that to say that the tendency for the sales tax is to fall and not to rise is not a correct appreciation of the position. On the other hand, the original estimate of Rs. 16·25

10th July 1952]

[Sri T. Viswanatham]

crores seems to be more correct and nothing has happened between March and June to underestimate the income under sales tax.' That is all the explanation I want to make."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"I wish the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition had been in my position. As far as we could see, the returns for March, April and May showed a downward trend. I think we have taken a very optimistic view of the future and made this estimate of Rs. 14.5 crores. I stand by that estimate and as I have said already I shall be more than satisfied and shall be very happy if the estimated amount is realized. Then, the Leader of the Opposition says: 'Here are two items—Grow More Food schemes which take away Rs. 60 lakhs of rupees and the tank improvement schemes which take away a like amount—and if these two schemes are given up, you will get another Rs. 120 lakhs.' May I inform hon. Members of this House that as far as each item is concerned, the provision is for the purpose of meeting expenses on the schemes which have already been started? I do not know how the schemes were selected. Perhaps Sri T. Viswanatham is more familiar with the history of the schemes, because he was also a Member of the party which was running the Government then. Sir, these provisions are for schemes which have already been started. We are not making such provisions in order that the Revenue Minister may satisfy the Public Works Minister or the Public Works Minister may satisfy the Finance Minister. It is not our intention to function that way at all and I may assure the Leader of the Opposition that that is not the way in which we function. To sum up, therefore, it is not as if we could avoid this expenditure of Rs. 120 lakhs and cover the deficit. As regards sales tax, as far as we could judge from the figures available, we could take credit for only Rs. 14.5 crores. I am sorry that the Leader of the Opposition jumped to the conclusion that this Budget could be a surplus one if we only tightened up here and there and got some four crores of rupees that way. He said, 'Then it will be a surplus Budget and there will not be any necessity for all these unpopular measures of taxation; become popular by avoiding further taxation.' I feel, that perhaps that was the very purpose for which the Leader of the Opposition was saying that there should be no taxation. It might have been easy for us to put up inflated figures and say that the taxes are unnecessary. I am sure that that is not the way of becoming a popular Finance Minister. I have to take note of actual, existing conditions. I have to take note of the circumstances prevailing. I cannot act on mere imagination or on paper. Therefore it is no use saying, cut two crores here and cut one crore there and you will have a surplus Budget. We do not want a manipulated Budget. That is why we honestly calculated the estimated revenues which would be available for this year, and have come with these proposals for taxation. If we want that the welfare schemes of the Government should be implemented, it is necessary that there should be some additional taxation.

"Before I actually take up the various measures of taxation proposed, I would like to refer to an argument often put forward

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

[10th July 1952]

by certain Members of the House, that is, the conflict between rural economy and urban economy. It is always said that amenities are provided for the urban areas alone and rural areas are neglected. But we should realize this fact that cities have grown. We cannot prevent their growth. Our present civilization is conducive to the growth of cities and when there is concentration of population in a limited area, that itself creates certain problems which have got to be solved. For example, take the Madras City. You have got tarred roads here. They are a necessity; they are not a luxury because you find thousands of cars running every minute on the roads here. Suppose the roads are not tarred; suppose the roads do not have a dust-proof surface. Do you think we will be able to sit in this Chamber now and deliberate? There will be nothing but dust everywhere. So also there should be drainage. Because of the concentration of population in these areas, water cannot be allowed to run in the open and get dried up. In a village, however, where there are a few houses and, therefore, a small flow of water from the gutter, we can allow it to run and get dried up. Here is a population which is big and the water running in the gutters here will form a rivulet if the water is not controlled. It will bring in its wake all kinds of diseases. We cannot shut our eyes to the concentration of people in a particular area. About the hospitals also, the same thing holds good. They have to be located only in concentrated areas, because there is always difference between rural life and city life. Here the place is more congested and more contaminated. In villages, on the contrary, there is good and free air. Life in villages is certainly better than urban life. Hospitals in congested areas are a necessity. That does not mean there should be no hospitals in villages. But it is not possible to locate hospitals with our present resources in every village or even in every big village. Therefore, they are to be located at a central place which will be easily accessible to all the villagers roundabout. They should be able to reach the place easily. Similarly, take colleges. They are located in cities. Many other institutions also grow like that. It is not quite intentional. Therefore, when we find that there are more amenities in the urban stations, they are but a natural growth; not an artificial growth, according to me. If we want that these cities should not grow, then we should stop the growth of the present civilization and revert to rural civilization. We cannot have it both ways. We must, therefore, take it that wherever there is a concentrated population, more amenities have got to be provided. Further it is not as if all the amenities provided there are exclusively restricted to the urban population. They are intended for the rural population also. The colleges, hospitals and various other institutions are not restricted to the use of the urban population only, but are also available to the villagers.

3-30
P.m.

"No doubt people living in the locality might derive greater benefit and greater advantage, but it is no argument to say that it is purely intended for the urban people. Therefore, if it is said that there is a conflict between the urban and rural interests, it

10th July 1952] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

is an artificial conflict, it is a conflict which we ourselves try to create and then try to end it. Let us look at the State as a whole and try to solve the problems and let us not be saying that many more amenities are required for the villages only. Many more amenities are required not only for the villages but for the towns also. Let us face problems bravely and let us not create more conflicts than necessary. Already there is conflict between class and class. Let us not create a new conflict between the rural and the urban population.

“ Next, Sir, I wish to refer to the Capital expenditure programme proposed in the Budget. Some suggestions were made; I say they were almost an accusation that we have cut down the Capital expenditure, even the expenditure that was provided in the interim Budget. I would request the hon. Members to look into the figures furnished in the Budget. At page 31, Appendix II, it will be found that the provision made under the interim Budget was Rs. 896.59 lakhs. It will be found therein an item, Rs. 80.00 lakhs towards lump-sum deduction for probable savings without showing where the actual cut is going to be made, so that it might be distributed over all the schemes mentioned therein. The only thing we have done in the present Budget is that we have distributed the Rs. 80 lakhs between the various schemes. We have done nothing more than that. In spite of that, it has been said that we have cut down even the interim Budget proposals. As far as our Capital expenditure is concerned, it is not so. If a reference is made to the totals, it will be found that the two figures tally, the figure under the interim Budget and the figure under the present Budget proposals. The figures are the same, namely, Rs. 896.59 lakhs. So also is the case with Capital outlay on Electricity schemes. A lump-sum deduction of Rs. 199.39 lakhs was provided in the interim Budget. This has been distributed under the different schemes but the total allotment in both the estimates is the same, namely, Rs. 8 crores. In spite of deterioration in our financial resources, we have tried our best to maintain the scale of Capital expenditure at the same level. Again it was said that we have slowed down work on the Malampuzha project and there is an impression also in the State that it has been slowed down. There was a slowing down no doubt in March last. That was because our resources ran short and we were not sure of the assistance that we would be getting from the Centre. Now the Centre has granted a loan of one crore of rupees specifically for the project and let me therefore assure hon. Members from Malabar that as far as this project is concerned, that work has already been speeded up and it will be maintained and the project finished within the scheduled time. Then reference was also made to the Manimuthar project. A provision of Rs. 50 lakhs was made in the interim Budget proposals in respect of this project. Now it has been cut down to Rs. 40 lakhs. This is only on account of the redistribution that we have made among the various schemes from out of the total lump-sum deductions for probable savings. As regards this project, one other factor has to be remembered. We have allotted Rs. 40 lakhs for this project. We are going to finish

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

[10th July 1952]

by certain Members of the House, that is, the conflict between rural economy and urban economy. It is always said that amenities are provided for the urban areas alone and rural areas are neglected. But we should realize this fact that cities have grown. We cannot prevent their growth. Our present civilization is conducive to the growth of cities and when there is concentration of population in a limited area, that itself creates certain problems which have got to be solved. For example, take the Madras City. You have got tarred roads here. They are a necessity; they are not a luxury because you find thousands of cars running every minute on the roads here. Suppose the roads are not tarred; suppose the roads do not have a dust-proof surface. Do you think we will be able to sit in this Chamber now and deliberate? There will be nothing but dust everywhere. So also there should be drainage. Because of the concentration of population in these areas, water cannot be allowed to run in the open and get dried up. In a village, however, where there are a few houses and, therefore, a small flow of water from the gutter, we can allow it to run and get dried up. Here is a population which is big and the water running in the gutters here will form a rivulet if the water is not controlled. It will bring in its wake all kinds of diseases. We cannot shut our eyes to the concentration of people in a particular area. About the hospitals also, the same thing holds good. They have to be located only in concentrated areas, because there is always difference between rural life and city life. Here the place is more congested and more contaminated. In villages, on the contrary, there is good and free air. Life in villages is certainly better than urban life. Hospitals in congested areas are a necessity. That does not mean there should be no hospitals in villages. But it is not possible to locate hospitals with our present resources in every village or even in every big village. Therefore, they are to be located at a central place which will be easily accessible to all the villagers roundabout. They should be able to reach the place easily. Similarly, take colleges. They are located in cities. Many other institutions also grow like that. It is not quite intentional. Therefore, when we find that there are more amenities in the urban stations, they are but a natural growth; not an artificial growth, according to me. If we want that these cities should not grow, then we should stop the growth of the present civilization and revert to rural civilization. We cannot have it both ways. We must, therefore, take it that wherever there is a concentrated population, more amenities have got to be provided. Further it is not as if all the amenities provided there are exclusively restricted to the urban population. They are intended for the rural population also. The colleges, hospitals and various other institutions are not restricted to the use of the urban population only, but are also available to the villagers.

3-30 P.m. “No doubt people living in the locality might derive greater benefit and greater advantage, but it is no argument to say that it is purely intended for the urban people. Therefore, if it is said that there is a conflict between the urban and rural interests, it

10th July 1952]

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

is an artificial conflict, it is a conflict which we ourselves try to create and then try to end it. Let us look at the State as a whole and try to solve the problems and let us not be saying that many more amenities are required for the villages only. Many more amenities are required not only for the villages but for the towns also. Let us face problems bravely and let us not create more conflicts than necessary. Already there is conflict between class and class. Let us not create a new conflict between the rural and the urban population.

“Next, Sir, I wish to refer to the Capital expenditure programme proposed in the Budget. Some suggestions were made; I say they were almost an accusation that we have cut down the Capital expenditure, even the expenditure that was provided in the interim Budget. I would request the hon. Members to look into the figures furnished in the Budget. At page 31, Appendix II, it will be found that the provision made under the interim Budget was Rs. 896.59 lakhs. It will be found therein an item, Rs. 80.00 lakhs towards lump-sum deduction for probable savings without showing where the actual cut is going to be made, so that it might be distributed over all the schemes mentioned therein. The only thing we have done in the present Budget is that we have distributed the Rs. 80 lakhs between the various schemes. We have done nothing more than that. In spite of that, it has been said that we have cut down even the interim Budget proposals. As far as our Capital expenditure is concerned, it is not so. If a reference is made to the totals, it will be found that the two figures tally, the figure under the interim Budget and the figure under the present Budget proposals. The figures are the same, namely, Rs. 896.59 lakhs. So also is the case with Capital outlay on Electricity schemes. A lump-sum deduction of Rs. 199.39 lakhs was provided in the interim Budget. This has been distributed under the different schemes but the total allotment in both the estimates is the same, namely, Rs. 8 crores. In spite of deterioration in our financial resources, we have tried our best to maintain the scale of Capital expenditure at the same level. Again it was said that we have slowed down work on the Malampuzha project and there is an impression also in the State that it has been slowed down. There was a slowing down no doubt in March last. That was because our resources ran short and we were not sure of the assistance that we would be getting from the Centre. Now the Centre has granted a loan of one crore of rupees specifically for the project and let me therefore assure hon. Members from Malabar that as far as this project is concerned, that work has already been speeded up and it will be maintained and the project finished within the scheduled time. Then reference was also made to the Manimuthar project. A provision of Rs. 50 lakhs was made in the interim Budget proposals in respect of this project. Now it has been cut down to Rs. 40 lakhs. This is only on account of the redistribution that we have made among the various schemes from out of the total lump-sum deductions for probable savings. As regards this project, one other factor has to be remembered. We have allotted Rs. 40 lakhs for this project. We are going to finish

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

[10th July 1952]

the Lower Bhavani Project and all the machinery which is being utilized for the Lower Bhavani Project will become available for transfer to the Manimuthar Project. Though in terms of actual money the provision might be only Rs. 40 lakhs, when we take into consideration the machinery we propose to transfer to this project, the total provision will be in the order of Rs. 70 to Rs. 75 lakhs. Therefore, hon. Members need not go under the impression that we want to slow down any scheme. As a matter of fact, it is to our interest, it is in the interest of the State that they should be speeded up and completed as early as possible, especially the half-finished scheme because the longer we delay the projects, the longer will be the dead capital locked up there without any return. Therefore, Government are interested in speeding up all projects and seeing that they are completed as early as possible.

“ With regard to electricity schemes also some reference was made to the effect that we are slowing down the schemes. It is not so. We are having many more schemes ready than necessary; as a matter of fact, there are so many schemes now ready that it will not be possible with our present financial resources to complete them this year. As far as extension of electricity is concerned, the bottleneck is not only finance; there is another bottleneck. However much we might wish, it will not be possible for us to overcome that bottleneck, particularly the bottleneck in copper wire. The annual requirement of copper for the Electricity department of this State is 1,500 tons but we are getting only a negligible fraction of this quantity. Recently, the raw materials section of the United Nations allocated 1,400 tons of copper for all the countries in the British Commonwealth including India, Ceylon, Great Britain, South Africa, etc. This is the allotment for the current year. This will show to what extent we are suffering for want of copper conductors. Therefore under the existing circumstances, we are interested in pushing up the electricity extension schemes as fast as possible, because we do realize that if we want to increase production of food, it can only be done by the completion of the irrigation projects and also by making cheap electric power available to the agriculturists to lift water for irrigation. From that aspect, it will be the endeavour of this Government to speed up all the schemes to the utmost extent possible.

“ Then, Sir, I will refer briefly to the various taxation proposals made by the Government and the counter-measures suggested by hon. Members. Once it is conceded that I have made out a fairly good case that additional resources are necessary for this Government if the Government were to carry out the schemes put before the House, we have to get on additional resource of about four crores of rupees. Wherefrom could it be got? Suggestions have been made that only the rich people who are able to pay should be taxed. I completely agree with them. But an alternative suggestion was also made. ‘ Why undertake these fresh taxation measures? Scrap Prohibition. You will get 16 crores of rupees.’ This was the suggestion made by some hon. Members on

10th July 1952] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

the other side and by some on this side also who think on the same lines. But let me tell them this. So far as Prohibition is concerned—I am dealing only with the financial aspect of it and not the moral or any other aspect,—it was contended that we would get Rs. 16 crores if Prohibition were scrapped. Wherefrom would we get this revenue? Hon. Members must realize that toddy was the main source of revenue, more than 75 per cent was from the sale of toddy. Who were the people who were drinking toddy? It was the lowest of the low, the Harijans and the classes just above them. They were the only persons, the poorest of the poor, that took to toddy and they were paying the tax through the sale of toddy. Rupees 12 crores out of the Rs. 16 crores that we got were made up of taxes collected from the poor people. Therefore, when people suggest, for purposes of raising revenue, that Prohibition should be scrapped, all the theory of taxing the rich and avoiding the poor goes to the wind. Therefore I say, if it is insisted that the tax should be collected from the comparatively rich people, then Prohibition should not be scrapped because as far as I know, it is the poorer classes of the people that pay. If you do not want to tax the poorest of the poor classes then you will have to oppose the scrapping of the Prohibition, because scrapping of Prohibition will be only taxing the poorest among the poor. (Applause.) Therefore let not hon. Members think that they could get Rs. 16 crores by abolishing Prohibition and we need not think of additional taxation. It will mean that we want to escape, sell toddy and get money from the poorest of the poor for our own purposes, for our own betterment. (Interruption.) The hon. Member Mr. Deivasigamani says that it is better than illicit liquor which is poison. With that, I am not concerned. I am concerned with the sale of toddy, whether we are justified in taxing the poor and get Rs. 16 crores. (An hon. Member: 'It is only a voluntary payment.') Even voluntary payment, even if it be charity, can it be taken from the poor people who most need it? Will it be good on our part to make some people pay because they do not know they are paying and thus contribute for the betterment of the better classes of people? Will it be social justice to take that money and utilize it for the common good of all the people? That is not anyhow according to the canons of taxation so far as I am able to understand them. (Hear, hear.) That is why we have made certain proposals, so that comparatively better-placed people might be taxed. That is why we have chosen the particular measures that we have placed before the House.

“Take for example the land revenue surcharge. It is easily asked: ‘Why should you have the surcharge on land revenue? There should be only agricultural income-tax.’ Yes, on principle I agree that the more scientific way of taxation is to have an agricultural income-tax. But do you realize the difficulties involved in it? Can you expect a poor ryot who is paying a kist even up to Rs. 250 or Rs. 300 to maintain accounts and satisfy the agricultural income-tax authorities? (Interruption.) Business is quite different; carrying on business requires the maintenance of account, but not so agriculture. Therefore there is a complete

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

[10th July 1952]

difference, a fundamental difference between business and agriculture. The conduct of a business by itself requires the maintenance of accounts. Without accounts, nobody can run a business. As far as agriculture is concerned, it will only be an additional burden and unnecessary expenditure imposed on the agriculturists. As far as I am concerned, I am prepared to say that many of the poor people paying a kist ranging from Rs. 50 to 300, if only they pay to the State Exchequer what they would be spending on clerks and others for the maintenance of accounts, would be paying double the tax that they would be paying according to the measures that we have now proposed. Therefore, it is not possible under the existing circumstances to impose agricultural income-tax. This aspect has been considered by the Land Revenue Reforms Committee and we came to the conclusion that it would be another sort of harassment if we introduced agricultural income-tax at this stage. The country should be prepared for it. It is not prepared for it now. That is why we proposed this levy of surcharge on land revenue. Many hon. Members agreed with this principle but said that the exemption limit of Rs. 50 was rather low and that it should be raised. Some hon. Members suggested that it should be Rs. 150 and others Rs. 200 to Rs. 250 and the Leader of the Opposition was generous enough to say that it should be Rs. 500. (The hon. Member Sri T. Viswanatham stood up in his seat.) What is the tax the hon. Member is paying?"

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"I am a commonest man. I do not pay any taxes."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"I am not going to address detailed arguments at this stage, because this measure will be coming up before the House at a later stage when it could be examined in detail. But what I want to say is this. Suggestions have been made to raise the minimum to Rs. 100 as it would be reasonable. What is the additional burden we impose on the people? Take the limit from Rs. 50 to Rs. 100. We propose that a surcharge of 2·5 per cent, that is, Rs. 12-8-0 should be paid. A person paying hundred rupees will be called upon to pay Rs. 112-8-0, i.e., an extra sum of Rs. 12-8-0. After all, the land available in this country is very limited and if we distribute the entire land *per capita*, it will come to not more than one acre per head and if that be so, people paying land revenue above Rs. 50 must be owning approximately more than about eight acres or nine acres of wet land and if it is good dry land it would be 15 to 20 acres. Should they not pay some additional tax when compared to others holding small pattas of half an acre, one acre, two acres or three acres?

3-45
p.m.

"It is in this view that Rs. 50 was taken as a reasonable limit. As far as higher income groups are concerned, suggestions have been made that a surcharge ranging from Re. 1 to Rs. 2 per rupee should be levied. If the hon. Members are really serious about it, we will consider that also. Another suggestion was also made that tea and coffee plantations are left free and that we are not taxing

10th July 1952] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

them enough. I wish to inform the House that we are not going to leave them untouched. If hon. Members go through the Report of the Land Revenue Reforms Committee, they will find that agricultural income-tax is proposed to be introduced and as far as these plantations are concerned, it is recommended that agricultural income-tax should be operative immediately and forthwith. We are prepared to stand by that recommendation." (Applause.)

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"When?"

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"Just now we have come. As soon as possible, we will take up this question also and see that agricultural income-tax is made applicable to tea and coffee plantations. It would not work any hardship also as accounts are already being maintained and they need not follow a new system hereafter. As far as the Centre is concerned, a percentage of the income is treated as non-agricultural and on that, income-tax is being levied. As far as the agricultural portion of the income is concerned, we shall examine the entire question thoroughly and bring forward measures for levying an agricultural income-tax.

"Then comes the surcharge on bus fare. It has been characterised as horrible. It has been stated, 'let us tax bus owners rather than the passengers'. Ultimately, it is the bus owners that are going to pay this tax. Even though at present we have allowed them to levy seven pies as maximum, in many places this maximum is not levied, because it is not quite economical. Therefore, Sir, I am prepared to consider proposals which will not fall heavily on the poor travelling public but would only cut into the large profits of bus owners. But, there is another aspect to this question. We have to take into account other vested interests likely to be affected. The vested interest in this case is the Centre. The Central Government are levying income-tax on the profits of the bus-owners and therefore if we try to cut into the profits of the bus-owners, the Central Government are likely to protest but I am sure I will have the co-operation and backing of the entire House in asking the Centre that, as far as we are concerned, we are entitled to tax the bus passengers and collect the tax from them. It is only from that point of view that we have levied the tax in this form and it is not our intention that the entire burden should fall only on the passengers. I am sure hon. Members will make suitable and very reasonable suggestions to remedy any of the defects or remove the difficulties in levying this tax.

"In regard to the betterment levy, many hon. Members opposed it. But, we should realize that it is the public funds, funds belonging to the entire people, that are spent on schemes which make the lands more valuable. There is an unearned increase in their value. Is not the State, representing and belonging to the entire people, having spent so much of public funds on the schemes, entitled to a share in the unearned increase in their value? I am sure hon. Members will agree that this is a just and fair proposal, that betterment levy should be levied on properties which get the

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

[10th July 1952]

advantage of the schemes that have been executed at public expenditure. And with that view, we have made certain proposals and they have got to be examined. Of course, in regard to the tax on foreign liquor, there has not been much opposition. With regard to these taxation measures, I want to say one thing to hon. Members. As far as I am concerned, I want to say "I don't have a closed mind. I am going to move a motion that these proposals may be referred to Select Committees so that those Select Committees may scrutinize them with the great care that is necessary in the case of these taxation proposals, so that when they emerge from the Select Committees, there will be no objection from any side of the House and all the hon. Members of the House, to whatever side they may belong, may feel that that we have made fair and just proposals and that these taxes fall on those who are able to pay and not on the poor people. It is only that aspect which should be scrutinized carefully by the Select Committees to be formed on the various taxation measures.

"Sir, I wish to say a few words regarding the community projects. It has been stated, 'these are American sponsored; Americans are behind these and they are trying to get hold of this country through community projects'. I am glad that all hon. Members are cautious and alert enough to see that no foreign State gets a foothold in this country. I am as much responsible and interested as Members on the other side that our country should not again fall into the hands of any other country or get into its clutches either economically or politically. I wish the hon. Members on the other side realize this fully and that is my appeal to them. Let us not walk into the parlours of America or England or Russia or China; let us be free from any of these dominations, from whatever side they may come and whatever creed they may profess. (Interruption from S. T. Adityan.) I am glad Mr Adityan agrees with it. I know some people agree with mental reservations."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"I have no mental reservations."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"I don't say Mr. Nagi Reddi has mental reservations. He is open-minded and without mental reservations. So, Sir, let us not get under the domination of any country. (Cheers.)

"Then, Sir, I turn to the Rayalaseema development schemes. Mr. Nagi Reddi is vitally interested and, as a matter of fact, every one of us is vitally interested because we cannot afford the ever recurring famine staring us again in the face. It is the duty of any Government to see that the conditions which exist in any part of the country and which contribute to the recurrence of famine, are removed as early as possible. A Development Board was specifically constituted for this purpose by the previous Government. As far as this Government are concerned, I can assure the hon. Members that it is the intention of this Government and it will be the endeavour of this Government, to develop this backward area as early as possible, so that it may no longer be subject to this ever-recurring famine. If I am unable to make concrete proposals here

10th July 1952] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

and now, it is because we don't have time to examine the various proposals before us to enable us to put before you a concrete scheme. But the matter is engaging the attention of the Government and they will evolve schemes for the development of the backward areas. I am sure Mr. Nagi Reddi will not insist, 'here and now you should give a scheme' and I hope he will be satisfied with the assurance I have given now."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"I will wait for the action."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"I agree that they have to judge us by our action and they should judge us by what we do. We would also judge the Opposition by what they do and how they act. I am going to stand this test and hope the Members of the Opposition also will be prepared for the same test."

"Sir, let me make a final appeal. Let us sink our differences, petty differences I say; there might be ideological differences; but let us work for the common good of this State, so that our people may get a better life and better opportunities and may be able to lead a life which would satisfy their essential needs at least. Not only the Government but the entire House is responsible and this House should be prepared to take the entire responsibility. The Opposition cannot say, 'We are only in the Opposition and our duty is only to oppose.' On the other hand, it is the greater duty of the Opposition, if we err to correct our errors and see even if we fail, we do not fail at a critical juncture and that the Government do their duty for the betterment of the common man. I am sure, with that co-operation and with that common fund of goodwill, we will be able to see that our State prospers for ever. (Cheers.) I thank you, Sir, for giving me this opportunity and also thank all the hon. Members for giving me a patient hearing." (Cheers.)

MR. SPEAKER:—"For the last six days, I have been observing the indiscriminate use of certain words by the Members and I want to bring it to the notice of the Members to-day. Hon. Members are using the words 'hon. Friend' indiscriminately. When a Member refers to a Member of his own party or side, he should refer to him as 'my hon. Friend'; if a Member wants to refer to a Member belonging to another party he should refer to him as 'the hon. Gentleman'. Members should make this distinction between 'hon. Friend' and 'hon. Gentleman'."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"Are they not friends, Sir?"

MR. SPEAKER:—"They are friends outside the Assembly."

SRI R. V. SWAMINATHAN:—"I want to suggest one thing, Sir. Many Members are new and they are not aware of the procedure. Instead of putting in writing how Members should address and all that, will it not be better if we have an informal meeting and discuss all these things?"

MR. SPEAKER:—"I will circulate a note as to what words should be used and the way in which hon. Members should address the Chair, as well as one another."

[10th July 1952]

[10th July 1952]

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—“ I may be permitted to say that I would like to continue to be a friend even with the Members of the Opposition.” (Laughter.)

MR. SPEAKER:—“ The difficulty is if the Hon. the Leader of the House addresses another Member as ‘ my hon. Friend Mr. . . . ’ those who read his speech will be under the impression that the gentleman to whom he has referred as friend, belongs to his Party. It will create confusion.

“ Regarding Demands, I must say that I have already had a meeting of the leaders in my chamber and we have come to a conclusion in the matter of allotting time for each Demand. It is not possible for every hon. Member to take part in the discussion on each Demand. The convention in our House is that no Member should take part in the Debate under more than two Demands. Then only it will be possible for every Member to take part in the debate on Demands. We should follow that convention, as otherwise some hon. Members will be deprived of any chance of speaking here.

“ I now adjourn the House to meet again at 10-30 a.m. on Saturday, 12th July 1952.”

The House then adjourned.

வாய்மையே வெல்லும்
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

